

Herbert S. Gould to be Foreign Service officer of class 2.  
Kenneth S. Patton to be Foreign Service officer of class 2.  
James B. Young to be Foreign Service officer of class 2.  
Harry E. Carlson to be Foreign Service officer of class 4.  
Jefferson Patterson to be Foreign Service officer of class 4.  
Harold L. Williamson to be Foreign Service officer of class 4.

David C. Berger to be Foreign Service officer of class 5.  
Ellis O. Briggs to be Foreign Service officer of class 5.  
Allan Dawson to be Foreign Service officer of class 5.  
William E. DeCourcy to be Foreign Service officer of class 5.  
Robert F. Fernald to be Foreign Service officer of class 5.  
John J. Muccio to be Foreign Service officer of class 5.  
Christian T. Steger to be Foreign Service officer of class 5.  
William H. Beach to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
George H. Butler to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
Leo J. Callanan to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
Selden Chapin to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
Prescott Childs to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
Winthrop S. Greene to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
William M. Gwynn to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
Julian F. Harrington to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.

George F. Kennan to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
Edward P. Lawton to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
Dale W. Maher to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
Gordon P. Merriam to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
C. Warwick Perkins, Jr., to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.

Samuel Reber to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
Joseph C. Satterthwaite to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.

George Tait to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
Angus I. Ward to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.  
S. Walter Washington to be Foreign Service officer of class 6.

LaVerne Baldwin to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.  
William W. Butterworth, Jr., to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.

Warren M. Chase to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.  
Oliver Edmund Clubb to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.  
Paul C. Daniels to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.  
Cecil Wayne Gray to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.  
Raymond A. Hare to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.  
Gerald Keith to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.  
Bertel E. Kuniholm to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.  
James S. Moose, Jr., to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.  
Henry S. Villard to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.  
George H. Winters to be Foreign Service officer of class 7.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### COLORADO

Will Van Engen, Crawford.  
James M. Faricy, Florence.  
Mathias J. Schmitz, Gunnison.  
James H. Parker, Julesburg.  
Cyril Edward Taylor, Spivak.  
James L. Allison, Woodmen.

##### CONNECTICUT

Charles J. Fields, Norfolk.

##### FLORIDA

Robert L. Horsman, Lake Worth.  
William H. Cox, Palmetto.

##### GEORGIA

Lois Horton, Guyton.  
Henry C. Hightower, McDonough.

##### INDIANA

Francis P. Gavagan, Chesterton.

##### LOUISIANA

Joseph J. Ferguson, New Orleans.

##### MAINE

Norman E. Willis, Harmony.  
Lula E. Crockett, North Haven.  
Spellman C. Marshall, Oakland.  
Ferdinand H. Parady, Orono.  
Edward C. Moran, Rockland.

##### MASSACHUSETTS

John J. O'Brien, Bridgewater.  
John J. Pendergast, Centerville.  
John F. Kennedy, Chicopee.  
Isabelle Crocker, Cotuit.  
Mary T. Harrington, Holden.  
Louis H. Chase, Norfolk.  
James L. Sullivan, Peabody.  
Philip Morris, Siasconset.  
Frank M. Merrigan, South Deerfield.  
Walter P. Cook, Yarmouth Port.

##### NEBRASKA

Oda D. Adkins, Arthur.

##### NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mina S. Roberge, Cascade.  
Harriet O. Harriman, Jackson.

##### NEW JERSEY

Rachel E. Berger, Ringoes.  
Susan L. Kenworthy, Wanaque.

##### NEW MEXICO

Irwin C. Floersheim, Springer.

##### NEW YORK

John H. Quinlan, Pavilion.  
Timothy V. O'Shea, Rome.  
Clarence A. Lockwood, Schroon Lake.

##### NORTH CAROLINA

Brevard E. Harris, Concord.  
Edgar S. Woodley, Creswell.  
Grady L. Friday, Dallas.  
Robert B. Mewborn, Grifton.  
William W. Fleming, Hot Springs.  
John P. LeGrand, Mocksville.  
James H. Ledbetter, Mount Gilead.  
Spurgeon K. Yelton, Spindale.

##### OHIO

Rollo C. Witwer, Akron.  
Francis P. Frebault, Athens.  
Leo V. Walsh, Barberton.  
Charles Wassman, Bellaire.  
Walter M. Dill, Fredericktown.  
May C. Eldridge, North Olmsted.  
Lawrence J. Heiner, Rutland.  
Harry L. Hines, Williamsburg.

##### OREGON

Floyd B. Willert, Dayton.  
Lemuel T. McPheeters, Hillsboro.  
Vinnie B. Lay, Powers.  
Von D. Seaton, Yamhill.

##### PUERTO RICO

Nicolas Ortiz Lebron, Aibonito.  
Carlos F. Torregrosa, Aguadilla.  
Cristina G. Sandoval, Hato Rey.  
Jose Monserrate, Salinas.

##### SOUTH DAKOTA

Kelsey R. Highsaw, Belle Fourche.  
Joseph H. Ryan, Madison.  
Thomas R. Mickelson, Wilmot.  
Edd A. Sinkler, Wood.

##### VIRGINIA

Harold W. Hale, Jr., Narrows.

##### WISCONSIN

Charles G. Pagel, Brandon.  
George B. Meulemans, Greenleaf.  
Anal E. Lennon, Hurley.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies, turn Thou to us. As servants of the Republic, we have our mission—a service that each may render, an influence that the humblest may exert. Heavenly Father, may we not be satisfied with just small achievements. With gratitude to Thee for Thy matchless providence, lead us in those paths that shall bring the best compensation to our country which has called us. O lift this glorious world out of the valley of dismay. Fill it with countless human creatures worthy and altogether capable of enjoying it. Pity the weak, the indolent, and the disobedient; have mercy upon them. We pray that our own land may be led higher and higher, where afflictions cease and national ills disturb no more. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 381. An act granting insurance to Lydia C. Spry;
- H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Joseph Maier;
- H. R. 762. An act for the relief of Stanislaus Lipowicz;
- H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Herman Schierhoff;
- H. R. 2469. An act for the relief of Michael P. Lucas;
- H. R. 3184. An act for the relief of H. D. Henion, Harry Wolfe, and R. W. McSorley;
- H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John T. Clark, of Seattle, Wash.;
- H. R. 5764. An act to compensate the Grand View Hospital and Dr. A. J. O'Brien;
- H. R. 6335. An act for the relief of Sam Cable;
- H. R. 7788. An act for the relief of Mrs. Earl H. Smith;
- H. R. 8032. An act for the relief of the Ward Funeral Home;
- H. R. 8038. An act for the relief of Edward C. Paxton;
- H. R. 8061. An act for the relief of David Duquaine, Jr.;
- H. R. 8110. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Gardiner;
- H. R. 8901. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near Apostle Islands, Wis.;
- H. R. 9200. An act authorizing the erection of a marker suitably marking the site of the engagement fought at Columbus, Ga., April 16, 1865;
- H. R. 9671. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of material to the sea-scout service of the Boy Scouts of America;
- H. R. 10185. An act to amend the act approved June 18, 1934, authorizing the city of Port Arthur, Tex., or the commission thereby created and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over Lake Sabine, at or near Port Arthur, Tex., and to extend the times for commencing and completing the said bridge;
- H. R. 10262. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges across the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Youghiogheny Rivers in the county of Allegheny, Pa.;
- H. R. 10316. An act to legalize a bridge across Poquetanuck Cove at or near Ledyard, Conn.;
- H. R. 10465. An act to legalize a bridge across Second Creek, Lauderdale County, Ala.;
- H. R. 10975. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of Marshy Hope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River, at and within a few miles of Federalsburg, Caroline County, Md., with a view to the controlling of floods;
- H. R. 11045. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Rockport, Ind., and Owensboro, Ky.; and
- H. R. 11425. An act for the relief of Gustava Hanna.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Odessa Mason;
  - H. R. 2982. An act for the relief of Sarah Shelton;
  - H. R. 3912. An act to amend an act for the relief of Clarence R. Killion;
  - H. R. 3952. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Lee;
  - H. R. 4387. An act for the relief of Barbara Backstrom;
  - H. R. 6297. An act for the relief of Leon Frederick Ruggles;
  - H. R. 6982. An act to amend section 80 of chapter 9 of an act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898;
  - H. R. 7024. An act to authorize the sale by the United States to the municipality of Hot Springs, N. Mex., the northeast half of the southeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 6, township 14 south, range 4 west, Hot Springs, N. Mex.;
  - H. R. 8030. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Republican River, Smoky Hill River, and minor tributaries of Kansas River, in the State of Kansas, with a view to the control of their floods;
  - H. R. 8069. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. S. Mull;
  - H. R. 11053. An act authorizing the President to present the Distinguished Service Medal to Commander Percy Tod, British Navy, and the Navy Cross to Lt. Comdr. Charles A. deW. Kitcat, British Navy; and
  - H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution to amend Public Act No. 435, Seventy-second Congress.
- The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:
- S. 813. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to establish a fish-cultural station in Arizona;
  - S. 1075. An act for the relief of Louis H. Cordis;
  - S. 1419. An act for the relief of George S. Geer;
  - S. 1975. An act to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy, officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps, and officers and enlisted men of the United States Army to accept such medals, orders, diplomas, decorations, and photographs as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered;
  - S. 2126. An act for the relief of Ralph Reisler;
  - S. 3128. An act for the relief of Daniel Yates;
  - S. 3160. An act to amend the law relating to residence requirements of applicants for examinations before the Civil Service Commission;
  - S. 3371. An act for the relief of John Walker;
  - S. 3372. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school district at Hays, Mont., for construction and improvement of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children;
  - S. 3411. An act to authorize the acquisition of land for military purposes at Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.;
  - S. 3445. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to release the claim of the United States to certain land within the Ouachita National Forest, Ark.;
  - S. 3460. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the persons entitled to compensation on account of Private Claim 111, parcel 1, Nambe Pueblo grant;
  - S. 3488. An act to provide for an examination and survey to determine the best utilization of the surplus waters of the San Juan River and to determine the feasibility and cost of storing such waters and of diverting them to the Rio Chama;
  - S. 3537. An act for the relief of Felix Griego;
  - S. 3581. An act for the relief of Henry Thornton Meriwether;
  - S. 3685. An act for the relief of George Rabcinski;
  - S. 3692. An act for the relief of William T. J. Ryan;
  - S. 3747. An act for the relief of Maizee Hamley;
  - S. 3770. An act to award a special gold medal to Lincoln Ellsworth;



S. 3781. An act limiting the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases;

S. 3821. An act to authorize the award of the Purple Heart decoration to Maj. Charles E. Sprague;

S. 3859. An act to authorize the procurement, without advertising, of certain War Department property, and for other purposes;

S. 3868. An act to amend section 32 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1935;

S. 3885. An act to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.;

S. 3950. An act to aid in defraying the expenses of the Sixteenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1937;

S. 3997. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Eighteenth National Convention of the American Legion at Cleveland, Ohio, during the month of December 1936;

S. 4026. An act to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended;

S. 4232. An act to create a commission and to extend further relief to water users on United States reclamation projects and on Indian irrigation projects;

S. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of silver medals to the personnel of the Second Byrd Antarctic Expedition;

S. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution amending paragraph (4) of subsection (n) of section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to extend the time within which contracts may be modified or canceled under the provisions of section 5 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4212) entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the National Housing Act, relating to the insurance of loans and advances for improvements upon real property, and for other purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BULKLEY, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. STEIWER, and Mr. TOWNSEND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today immediately after disposition of the pending special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, Members on this side have been granted 35 minutes to address the House this morning. We are very anxious to take up and finish a bill today, and I hope no other similar requests will be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### PURCHASE OF POTATOES AND CHERRIES BY THE SURPLUS CROP RELIEF CORPORATION FOR RELIEF PURPOSES

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter which I wrote to Harry L. Hopkins, of the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written

by me to Hon. Harry L. Hopkins, Chairman of the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation:

MARCH 25, 1936.

HON. HARRY L. HOPKINS,  
President, Federal Surplus Relief Corporation,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOPKINS: On April 1, 1935, I wrote you with reference to the purchase of potatoes made by the Surplus Crop Relief Corporation for relief purposes. I stated then, and I say now, that I was under the impression that the surplus crop was to be purchased where the surplus crop was for relief purposes by your Corporation. At that time I wrote you, in part, as follows:

"I wish to call your attention to the following statement based upon the facts given in your letter and the above report. Idaho produced in 1934, 19,240,000 bushels of potatoes, or 5 percent of the total 1934 crop, and furnished 559 carloads of potatoes. Maine produced 56,280,000 bushels, or 14.6 percent of the total crop, and furnished 2,300 cars. Maryland produced 3,267,000 bushels, or eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total crop, and furnished 106.6 cars. Michigan produced 34,304,000 bushels, or 8.8 percent of the total crop, and furnished 180 cars. New York produced 32,550,000 bushels, or 8.4 percent of the total crop, and furnished 300.8 cars. North Carolina produced 10,672,000 bushels, or 2.7 percent of the total crop, and furnished 211.8 cars. Virginia produced 13,433,000 bushels, or 3.4 percent of the total crop, and furnished 1,392.3 cars. Wisconsin produced 31,320,000 bushels, or 8.1 percent, and furnished 181.4 cars. Minnesota produced 23,380,000, or 6 percent of the total crop, and was allowed to furnish none of the potatoes, according to your letter.

"I wish to call your attention to the fact that while Maine produced approximately one and a half times as many potatoes as Michigan produced, she was allowed to furnish nearly 13 times as many potatoes as Michigan furnished. While Maryland produced less than one-tenth of the potatoes Michigan produced, she was given 106 cars to Michigan's 180 cars. While Michigan produced two and a half times as many potatoes as Virginia, Virginia was allowed to furnish more than seven and a half times as many as Michigan was permitted to furnish. In view of the fact that Michigan stood third in the amount of potatoes produced and Michigan farmers and produce men are holding this tremendous surplus on their hands, I feel that the above method of handling this surplus is not fair and just to the growers of my State."

I received a reply but no satisfaction. I did hope, however, that Michigan would receive a square deal with reference to the purchasing of potatoes for relief out of the 1935 crop. I now have before me the report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as to potatoes purchased, and also the Crops and Markets Report, published monthly by the Department of Agriculture. These reports show the following purchases of potatoes as compared to production of potatoes in the States quoted during the year 1935:

State	Quantity produced	Quantity purchased
	Bushels	Bushels
Idaho.....	17,800,000	206,530
Maine.....	56,280,000	1,533,320
Maryland.....	3,113,500	91,560
Michigan.....	34,304,000	108,313
New Jersey.....	9,750,000	55,438
New York.....	32,550,000	180,600
Pennsylvania.....	22,572,000	123,032
Virginia.....	11,352,000	355,904
Wisconsin.....	31,320,000	181,780
Minnesota.....	23,380,000	None

I call attention again to the fact that while Maine produced approximately 50 percent more potatoes than Michigan, she was allowed to furnish 15 times as many potatoes for relief purposes as Michigan was allowed to furnish. Maine furnished 1,533,320 bushels, while Michigan was only allowed to furnish 108,313 bushels. While Michigan produced 50 percent more potatoes than Idaho produced, Idaho was allowed to furnish nearly twice as many as Michigan. Idaho furnishing 206,530 bushels, while Michigan furnished 108,313 bushels. The same is true with practically every State mentioned above. There may be some justification for buying more potatoes in New York because the place of production is close to the place of consumption. This applies equally to Michigan. When you look over the map, you will find that Michigan is in the center of a large population, with such cities as Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, Toledo, and other large cities, which should naturally receive their potato supply from Michigan. While I realize that Virginia is an early-potato State, Maine and Michigan are both late-potato States, and there is no justification for this discrimination.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that despite the fact that Michigan leads the world in the production of cherries, and that we have had the largest cherry surplus in the cherry crop in the United States, the cherry grower was given no consideration by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation in any purchase made, for your letter of March 12 states that no cherries were purchased during the calendar year of 1935.

I protested recently to the proper department because Oregon cherries were sent into Michigan to the C. C. C. camps. Despite the fact that Michigan leads the world in the production of cherries, the Government saw fit to buy Oregon cherries and shipped



them into Michigan at a much higher price. Every year we send a Cherry Queen to Washington to present a cherry pie to the President of the United States. The President last year graciously received the Cherry Queen and the pie, and we have a right to assume he ate it. Surely, if these cherries are good enough, as I stated before, for the President of the United States, they ought to be good enough for the C. C. C. camps.

After my protest of last year I had hoped the potato and cherry growers of my State would receive a square deal from the New Deal, but apparently the only thing we are getting is a "raw deal", as the above facts indicate.

Unless you can give me some legitimate reasons for not giving Michigan a square deal, I do not care to have you answer this letter. I would like to have reasons, but not excuses.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

#### FLOOD-CONTROL BILL

The SPEAKER. Under the special order for today the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, following the recent flood disasters which have destroyed property estimated to be worth at least a quarter of a billion dollars, and which have taken a number of lives in the New England States, may I say I feel that the Flood Control Committee of the House may today say, "We told you so." Last August a flood-control bill was passed by this House, the first flood-control bill ever to pass this House which included reservoirs as a method of tributary control. This bill passed amid the cries of "pork barrel", "logrolling", and amid the cry of trying to build up something for the future campaign, but the bill was passed, and now we have demonstrated that floods are the greatest menace to the future prosperity and welfare of this country.

This bill is now receiving consideration by the Senate Commerce Committee. May I call the attention of the House that it should pass at this session? [Applause.] On the whole, H. R. 8455 contained good projects, and if returned by the Senate with the addition of projects for eastern streams recently in flood it will be a credit to this Congress. We should consider that it is not only the loss of property, stores, and goods, and the lives which may be destroyed, but these floods are the plague which has accompanied the open-door policy of America.

We have dissipated our national resources, and this is the plague that always follows disaster. We moved over the whole virgin country of our Nation like a vast plague of locusts. We cut the timber. We destroyed the streams, and then, after we had exhausted the forests, we went out to my country and plowed up the grass, so that the last vestige of natural resources was taken from the face of this Nation. This was done to build up the Nation. We looked upon any nation that husbanded its natural resources as a country that was undeveloped. If our own resources were not exploited, we pointed our finger and said: "There is some land, there is some timber, there is some prairie sod that has not been devastated. Let us develop it." In this development no cognizance was taken of what future generations would have to live on. When we take into consideration that the whole capital structure of this Nation is built on bonds, whether these bonds be Federal, municipal, industrial, or railroad bonds, they are the backbone of the capital structure. In reality these bonds are a mortgage on the natural resources of this country, a mortgage on the productivity of the soil. If this productivity decreases, the value of the railroad capital structure decreases; the value of the insurance companies' resources from which they pay their claims decreases; and the ability of the Government to operate decreases. So the whole Nation rests not on what we can drain out of the soil, not what we can squeeze out in the shortest number of years, but this is the policy this Nation has followed since its inception. The future happiness and welfare of every man and woman in this country depends on our recognition of the necessity to sustain production in the years to come. The responsibility is ours as Members of Congress, whatever may be the cost, be it one billion or fifty billion dollars, in order to insure the continuance of this Nation and to close the door on the policy of "haste to develop" that up to now has left no room in the picture for the thought of conservation.

Mr. Speaker, we have dredged rivers, we have drained swamps, we have put in roads to help carry the flood waters to the Gulf and the oceans. We have spent over a billion dollars dredging our rivers and harbors in the last 10 years, taking the very lifeblood of the Nation and piling it up in the form of levies. Now, we have a flood in the East. What is going to be the result of that flood? Because there is a bill pending in the Senate we will go over there and mechanically propose to put an end to all floods in the East. The engineers by figuring in exact sums will say: "We will build a dam here and it will take care of so many acres of flood water. We will build another one over here and it will do the same thing." But if we do not look after the areas back of those dams, if we do not carry out a policy as proposed in the agricultural bill that was passed the other day, which provided for the proper handling of land back of these dams, if we do not continue our soil-conservation program and the education of our farmers, the expenditure of one, two, three, or four hundred million dollars will be for monuments to man's stupidity, because in 30 years these dams will be useless. They will be filled with silt. They will be just impediments in the progress of our Nation. But that is the American way of doing things when it comes to dealing with natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, if we can do something immediately, if we can offer something that will show up for this fiscal year, we think we have accomplished a great deal. Are we going to rush in with that thought in mind without thinking about the drainage areas back of these dams and put up these structures which in 30 or 40 years may be absolutely worthless?

I am grateful that we have a party leader that recognizes this problem. His theories may not have been carried out, but he realizes the problem and has made a start. We put an awful burden on the shoulders of Mr. Tugwell when we said, "Yours is the duty of resettlement; yours is the problem of bringing this distressed land back into some useful program and disposing of the poor people who are trying to live on it." What a task for one Government department to restore productivity nature spent centuries in building. Man destroyed these treasures in 100 years. A century of progressive leadership with man aiding Nature will see us on the road back.

I drove down through the Carolinas not so long ago. Every road was filled with trucks carrying chemical fertilizer. The smell filled the air. When you look at the texture of the soil you realize that chemicals can never make this land continue to be productive. Only nature can provide the necessary humus for the correct soil texture.

Farther down, as you approach Florida, the area that was once covered with splendid productive timber was being burned off because the grass would be a little better in the spring. Immediate use of the land is all that is considered, because we maintain that we must have the individual right to despoil this country of all its natural resources. We maintain that the land cannot be taken out and put into Federal reserves. Why, it would take it off the local tax rolls, but year after year more of it is drained of its last productivity until it produces neither revenue for the owner nor revenue for the local entity.

It is my prediction that this Government will have to purchase 100,000,000 acres of land. Who else has the capital? Who else can borrow money at a rate of interest that will allow him to accumulate worthless land that, at best, will require from 5 to 10 years to be brought back to any semblance of productivity. It now furnishes a harbor for the poor tenant farmer to squat on and try to raise just enough to eke out an existence, without any thought of whether it will continue to be a guaranty for the payment of the obligations of this Nation.

I also drove through the old State of Tennessee, and when I saw a farmer plowing up a very steep hillside I got outside and asked, "How long will this field produce?" He said, "Three or four years, and then it will look like the one next to it", and the next field was just a series of gullies, but he said, "The fellow who owns it does not live here and does not know about it, and he has to get something out of the land."



This is the problem that is facing the Nation. We have a system proposed by the Army engineers to expend \$1,000,000,000 on reservoirs all over the United States that they state would completely control the lower Mississippi, but because the Army engineers many years ago started out on the proposition that the floods in the States constituted a State proposition or a local proposition, it was held that the water does not become a national proposition until it reaches the lower Mississippi. It then becomes a national problem. So they have patiently expended \$292,000,000 since 1928 on works to take care of the water after it gets down there.

The water situation is a national problem in every State in the Union and on every stream. The fact that our cities dispose of their sewage, that should be restored to the soil, by poisoning our streams, killing all the fish, and changing our once clear water into cesspools is only a phase of the price we have paid for individual and State rights to destroy natural resources. If this Congress does not recognize this fact now, it will do so 5 or 10 years later, after the destruction has continued and we have continued to wash this soil on down our polluted rivers and out into the Gulf and the ocean to be picked up by barges and carried out to sea. We are aiding the water to carry out to sea the only guarantee of the future of this country.

How much land do we have, anyway? There is less than 2,000,000,000 acres of land in this Nation. Only 413,000,000 acres of land in the entire Nation is fit for cultivation, and 100,000,000 acres of our total productive land has already been destroyed.

Then you say, "Oh, we can reclaim the deserts." We do not know how long they will be productive after they are reclaimed; but let me tell the House that they contemplate spending, under the program now under way, a billion dollars to reclaim 4,000,000 acres of desert land that nobody knows how long will be productive under water or how much it will produce.

This is not something that is going to affect us in the next century. If the present attitude of saying that we cannot tackle the problem is continued, in 10 years this area of 75,000,000 acres from North Dakota to Texas will be destroyed. Only a part of the picture when you consider the worn-out lands in New England and the South. This is a job for the Congress to tackle in a resettlement program and not for an Under Secretary of Agriculture. Although you must admire his nerve to tackle such a huge program. It is the biggest job that ever faced this Nation.

This desert extends from the North Dakota line down into Texas and it is marching every year. In my lifetime I have seen it come east. I have seen fields that were once beautiful wheat fields now blowing sand, and, of course, it will be just like the floods. When it destroys half of the great grain belt, when it comes down here to Washington and makes it so we can hardly sit in this chamber on account of the infiltration of dust, then we will say that for the next fiscal year we will allow so much money to meet the problem.

The whole thing is going to take a lifetime to solve, and it should be undertaken on a nonpartisan national basis that recognizes that the only agent to solve such a problem is the Federal Government.

If it interferes with exploitation by individuals it will have to interfere; we have given them the cream of the Nation. The open-door policy lauded so highly by Alfred E. Smith in his Washington speech, letting the individual do what he wishes with his own land, has permitted them to take all of the top. After the horse is stolen the Federal Government is going to lock the door. If we do not lock the barn door the barn will be gone. [Applause.]

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Ludlow] for 20 minutes.

MR. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the House for its generous courtesy in giving me time to speak on a subject very dear to my heart.

MR. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. LUDLOW. I yield.

MR. MAVERICK. I feel inclined to introduce a privileged resolution some time today for Congress to adjourn on the 11th day of May. I think we can plan the work so that we can adjourn at that time. What does the gentleman think of it?

MR. LUDLOW. I have not had time to think anything about it. [Laughter.] I do have a strong conviction that Congress ought not to adjourn until it does something of a more adequate nature than it has done to keep this Nation out of war. When that is done I think an early adjournment would be advisable, but not until that is done.

MR. MAVERICK. Does not the gentleman think that we should plan the work so that we can get out as soon as we can?

MR. LUDLOW. I think that would be wise.

MR. MAVERICK. Of course; if we plan our work we can finish before May 11. We have the appropriation bills, the antilobbying bill today, the Bankhead tenant bill, and legislation on rural electrification. We ought to have a housing bill, and legislation on natural resources; in any event, we ought to plan our work and get out in a reasonable time instead of staying here on a treadmill. I thank the gentleman for permitting me to take this time, and I am glad to say his work on keeping this Nation out of war is an admirable one.

MR. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have arisen with some temerity, but from a sense of duty, to urge Members of the House of Representatives, with all the strength of argument and power of persuasion I can command to make a move forthwith to force the hand of the upper branch of Congress on legislation to extract the profit from war, thus vindicating the position on war profits taken by the House last year and rescuing from utter abandonment and despair the very wise and salutary movement which this House has started to keep America out of war by removing the profit incentive to war.

The way to rescue anti-war-profits legislation from its perilous position in the Senate and speed it on the way to enactment is for this House to take up and pass House Joint Resolution No. 167, which I have introduced and which provides a certain way to extract the profit from war by constitutional amendment.

Members of the House, I firmly believe, can render a public service of enormous value and vindicate the hopes of the rank and file who want protection from war if they will go to the Speaker's desk and sign discharge petition no. 28, which I have filed under the rules of the House, to bring my war referendum and anti-war-profits joint resolution out of committee and before the House for debate and action. I do not believe there is any more patriotic service a Member of the House could perform at this time than to sign that discharge petition.

If for no other reason, my resolution should be brought out of committee and passed to reaffirm and emphasize the position this House already has taken—and well taken—for anti-war-profits legislation. Over at the other wing of the Capitol they are playing battledore and shuttlecock with the McSwain bill which we passed here to put a curb on war profiteers, and there is every reason to believe it will be allowed to die unless the House does something rather drastic and dramatic to rescue this very vital and important principle. If the House will now pass my resolution for a constitutional amendment which covers the same subject and send it over to the Senate the game of battledore and shuttlecock will cease and we may expect some direct, straightforward performance.

The House ought to take this action. It ought to adopt my resolution. It owes to an expectant and tremendously interested country a duty of using this method of reaffirming its position in favor of taking the profits out of war. This policy of reaching the war evil is distinctly a House policy. The House, having proposed it and adopted it, should not permit it to die like a neglected foundling on the Senate's doorsteps.

The House is the body that history and tradition recognize as being nearest to the rank and file of our countrymen.



It is supposed to reflect, and I believe it does reflect, though sometimes dimly and imperfectly, the hopes and aspirations of the common people. I predict that if this Chamber, which symbolizes popular sovereignty, would pass my anti-war-profits constitutional amendment and send it over to the other body, that body would cease dillydallying and do something to cooperate with the House in keeping America out of war.

The House was everlastingly right when it took its stand last year for removal of the profits from war. It ought to stick to its guns and reaffirm its position by adopting my resolution by an overwhelming and impressive vote. Then we shall get somewhere. Spurred by this demonstration the other body, unless I am mistaken, will then pass either the McSwain bill or my resolution and, in either event, the common people—those who have to suffer and die when war comes—will win a great and significant victory.

Have you ever stopped to consider that over 23,000 American millionaires were made during the World War and that up to date, as shown by official records, one American munitions firm has reaped the dizzy profit of 1,143,725 percent on its original investment? You can see from the amazing hearings of the Nye committee how the bloody business of war fattens the fortunes of those who engage in it. While our boys in the trenches were going through hell itself in 1917 and 1918, the president of a large steel corporation was receiving bonuses totaling \$2,887,725 and officials of munitions concerns were drawing salaries that stagger the imagination. Take the profit out of war and there will be few wars.

This House did something very fine; it did something very grand; it wrote an epochal chapter in history when it rallied at the last session to the principle of extracting the swollen profits from war. Let us not run away from that great principle like whipped dogs. Remembering our obligations to humanity and the country's eagerness to keep out of war, let us stand by that principle and revitalize it by passing the resolution I have introduced.

I have arisen to point out exactly the action I think should be taken by this House to register another milestone—an important milestone—in the direction of permanent peace.

The time to act is now and the course to be followed is plain.

Responsive to the almost universal sentiment of America, which is opposed to allowing selfish influences to maneuver this country into war for the sake of profit, this House of Representatives on April 9 last, passed the McSwain bill to take the profit out of war. The unanimity and determination with which the House went on record against war profiteering are shown by the report of that day's proceedings. Of 383 Members who were present and who responded to the roll call, 368 voted for the McSwain anti-war-profits bill and only 15 voted against it.

I wish that the time allotted to me today would permit me to quote the many eloquent speeches made by Members of the House in that debate denouncing war profits as a cause of war. Many of them are gems worthy of being embalmed in permanent literature. One of the most impressive of the numerous very striking utterances was by our able colleague, Representative FRED J. Sisson, of New York, who asked the question, "Who won the World War, anyway?" and then answered it thus:

Why, the war profiteers are the only ones who won the World War, because they added to their swollen fortunes; they increased the wealth and power of a few men at the cost of millions of heartaches and a hell of suffering beyond the power of any tongue to describe.

In passing the McSwain bill the House proved in a fine way its responsiveness to the universal demand that the Seventy-fourth Congress shall do something to protect our boys from being dragged into slaughter pens in foreign countries. It recognized in a very impressive manner the fact that if the profit is taken out of war there will be few wars.

McSWAIN BILL PIGEONHOLED

But what has happened to the McSwain anti-war-profits bill? It will soon be a year since that most meritorious

measure, in which rest the hope and faith of the American people for protection from unjustifiable wars, passed this body.

Two days after its passage here it was read in another body and referred to the special committee on investigation of the munitions industry. That committee held it 29 days and referred it to the Committee on Military Affairs. That committee held it 13 days and referred it to the Committee on Finance. While the last-named committee from time to time makes some show of activity in regard to the measure, my firm conviction is that its final reference is going to be to a pigeonhole, where it will be resting when this Seventy-fourth Congress adjourns sine die unless this House, by some wise and energetic action, can do something to retrieve this very vital principle from the danger it is in of being submerged by approaching adjournment.

Now, I believe that the House can act wisely and that it can act effectively and that it should act as quickly as possible to save this situation.

On February 14, 1935, now considerably more than a year ago, I introduced a proposed anti-war-profits amendment to the Constitution of the United States (House Joint Resolution No. 167), and I quote the second section of the proposed constitutional amendment—the section that deals with war profits—as follows:

SEC. 2. Whenever war is declared the President shall immediately conscript and take over for use by the Government all the public and private war properties, yards, factories, and supplies, fixing the compensation for private properties temporarily employed for the war period at a rate not in excess of 4 per centum, based on tax values assessed in the year preceding the war.

The proposed constitutional anti-war-profits amendment, which I introduced, has now been pending more than 13 months before the House Committee on the Judiciary without action. Availing myself of my parliamentary rights I have filed at the Speaker's desk a petition to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further control over House Joint Resolution No. 167, to the end that that very important resolution may be brought forward from the committee's pigeonhole into the light of the floor of this House for consideration and debate and action on its merits.

If it comes out of the committee I shall be entirely willing that it shall be thrown wide open for amendment. I have no pride of authorship and I will gladly accept any perfecting amendments that will not destroy the purposes of the resolution. In the resolution I have introduced, the anti-war-profits section is joined with a section providing for a popular vote on a declaration of war. If in the judgment of the House the two propositions should not be joined I shall agree to having them segregated for separate votes.

#### HOUSE CAN SAVE THE SITUATION

The point I am leading up to—and I believe it is an important and vital point in the achievement of peace legislation in this Congress—is that if the House will now take up and pass my proposed anti-war-profits constitutional amendment and send it over to another body, that action will most surely stir the other body out of its apparent attitude of indifference and lethargy, and then we may look forward to some action at this session to take the profit out of war, either by statute or by constitutional amendment.

Personally, I think a constitutional amendment is much to be preferred, as the selfish forces that sometimes maneuver a country into war have such control when the war stage is set as to enable them to wipe off from the statute books instantaneously any statutes that interfere with their nefarious purposes. They could not get rid of a constitutional amendment so conveniently and easily. Only a constitutional amendment has the permanency and stability necessary to meet this situation.

#### HAMILTON FISH'S SPEECH

I wonder if the Democratic side of the House, to which I belong, is going to pass unnoticed the sharp and stirring challenge issued by the gentleman from New York, Mr. HAMILTON FISH, in his very able speech in this chamber on March 11. The gentleman from New York is a very vigorous



speaker and he never anesthetizes the subjects he operates on. He is a good deal of a partisan and sometimes does not rub the fur of our Democratic friends the right way, but I want to say this about him: He is also a great deal of a patriot and I admire him immensely, not only for his courage and ability, but also for the fact that although he was born to the purple, he takes the people's view of these great human questions. He is in favor of a referendum on war because he thinks that those who have to suffer, and if need be to die, and to bear the awful burdens and costs of war, should have something to say as to whether war shall be declared.

He also believes in taking the profits out of war. Mr. FISH is one of the signers of the discharge petition I have filed to bring my war referendum and antiwar profits resolution out of committee to the floor of the House for action, and I thank him kindly for his valuable support. In his speech in the House on March 11 Mr. FISH spoke approvingly of the McSwain bill to take the profit out of war—the bill that is now being put to sleep in another body—and the following colloquy ensued:

Mr. McFARLANE. Does not the gentleman know that we passed that legislation last session, and it is buried in a pigeonhole over in the Senate, where it will probably die?

Mr. FISH. I knew that. I am glad the gentleman stated it; but, after all, you have a Democratic Congress and a Democratic Senate. You say to me, "Bring it out." How could I bring it out? You are responsible for legislation. You have a 3-to-1 vote in the Senate and a 3-to-1 vote here. I believe that bill would be a great deterrent to war. I do not mind saying that I loathe and abhor war. There is almost nothing that I would not do to prevent war or to make it less likely. Take the profit out of war, so in another war industry will not make all these unlimited millions. I believe in the incentive of the profit system and in the American industrial system based upon private initiative and reasonable profit; but, if we do not take the profit out of war in future wars, particularly the munitions industry, then I am for Government ownership and operation of the munition industry in America.

#### CANNOT THROTTLE THESE MEASURES AND KEEP FAITH

Mr. FISH is right. We of the Democratic Party do have an overwhelming majority in both branches of Congress. On us rests not the entire responsibility, but the principal responsibility, for legislation. If we are to throttle these great measures that are intended to keep America out of war, and are to permit them to be killed in committees, fiddling while the world burns, and the dreaded time of American involvement draws ever nearer, the American people will hold us primarily responsible, though they will not excuse Members of the minority party who might be assisting us in the passage of this legislation.

#### OVER 1,100,000 PERCENT PROFIT

Take the profit out of war and there will be few wars. I repeat that aphorism because it is so everlastingly true. If you want to get a vivid picture of how profits enter into the fomentation of wars, read the hearings before the Nye investigating committee, which comprise one of the most shameful records ever written into legislative annals, showing how greedy, selfish interests have thumbed their noses at solemn treaties and embargoes and have deliberately incited nations to war for the purpose of coining filthy profits out of human blood, the profits in the case of one company rising to over 1,100,000 percent on the original investment!

"Again we dream as war clouds gather", declares that practical old warrior, Gen. James E. Harbord, in a recent magazine article. Let us quit dreaming and do something to justify the confidence and the expectations of those who sent us here and who are looking to us to keep our fine American boys out of the hell of foreign wars.

#### DISCHARGE PETITION NO. 28 MAKES ACTION ON WAR PROFITS LEGISLATION POSSIBLE

I plead with Members of the House to sign discharge petition no. 28. Let us get my anti-war-profits constitutional amendment out of committee and pass it and send it to the other body to let that other body know that we were in earnest and meant business when we passed the McSwain anti-war-profits bill. In that way we may hope for some action at this session in line with our promise to the American people to do something to keep our country out of war. Time is fleeting rapidly, and if we do not do this the Seventy-

fourth Congress will come to an end with our promise unredeemed and with a mark of disgrace against our record which time will not efface. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for 20 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in my time I may be permitted to read a letter from the Comptroller, and also the extracts from a letter from the A. A. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. It is my intention to introduce a privileged resolution that Congress shall adjourn on the 11th day of May. I want to help establish a sort of finish-our-business-and-adjourn consciousness. What does the gentleman think about it?

Mr. TABER. Congress had better adjourn before they appropriate and obligate all the money in the Treasury and all the country can bear.

Mr. MAVERICK. Does the gentleman think that we can do it so as to adjourn on May 11? [Laughter.]

Mr. TABER. At the rate they are going now they will have appropriated and authorized four or five times as much as there is in the Treasury.

Mr. MAVERICK. In any event, the gentleman does not think that May 11 will be too late, does he?

Mr. TABER. It will be too late unless you stop this spending business.

Mr. Speaker, on the 21st of February I introduced House Resolution 426, calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish the House of Representatives forthwith the name and address and the amount paid to each producer receiving more than \$2,000 in each calendar year, pursuant to the A. A. A. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture of the House. That committee communicated with the A. A. A. Mr. Chester Davis, the head of that organization, replied to them—the date is not here, but the reply appears on page 3064 of the Record—indicating that—

Our comptroller estimates that it would take more than 6 weeks working his staff in two shifts to get this data. During this time about 80 percent of the machine equipment of the comptroller's office would be tied up. This would mean a practical stop in getting out checks to farmers on payments not yet made in connection with 1935 program. The expense, of course, would be great. We also doubt whether any really useful purpose could be served by gathering this data. The records, of course, show the amount of payments made by commodities.

The Committee on Agriculture on March 2 brought in a report recommending, in view of that letter, that the information be not demanded. A little later Senator VANDENBERG introduced in another body a resolution calling for practically the same information. That resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and last week one day Senator VANDENBERG commented very forcefully upon the failure and the unwillingness of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to furnish the information.

Following the receipt of that information, I began an investigation to find out how near the Secretary of Agriculture and the A. A. A. came to telling the truth. Secretary Wallace gave an interview which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of yesterday, stating that it would require the whole force of the Comptroller General's office for 6 months to work that situation out. What is the whole force of the Comptroller General's office? Four thousand one hundred and fifty employees. I took the matter up with the Comptroller General's office, and I have received a letter from the Comptroller General's office, showing conclusively just what it would take to get the information. These checks that are paid to these people are perforated and punched by the check-printing machines that the Government uses. As I understand it, the Government has 10 of these over in the Division of Disbursements of the Treasury Department. Some of the time these machines have been working 24 hours a day on three shifts. At the present time I



understand they are working about one and a half shifts, and I read from a letter which I received from the Comptroller General under date of March 26. It came in yesterday afternoon.

It is estimated by a representative of my office with some experience with these cards and their use that by use of high-speed punch-card sorting machines the punch cards for payments of \$1,000 or more could be segregated at the rate of approximately 147,000 per 7-hour day. Upon an estimated total of 25,000,000 cards for all payments on all commodities, it would require approximately 170 days of 7 hours each for one machine and one operator, or 17 days for 10 machines and operators.

By putting on three shifts in 17 days, or practically 3 weeks, all those checks of \$1,000 and over can be segregated. As near as I can get at it, there are perhaps 20,000 to 25,000 of those payments of over \$1,000 each. It is a fact that you can get at the payments of over \$1,000 more easily than you can at payments over \$2,000, because the number of figures involved on the checks governs the group into which checks can be segregated by the check-sorting machines. I quote further from the letter:

It is his view that segregation by payments of \$1,000 would be better adapted to the sorting machines than segregation by payments of \$2,000.

He further estimates that from the cards for payments of \$1,000 or more, thus segregated, such payments could be listed by tabulating machines at the rate of approximately 480 per hour for one machine and operator.

That means that these items could be listed in approximately 50 hours, or possibly 60 hours of labor, to be on the safe side, by perhaps two people working for a week, and the contracts could undoubtedly be examined in another week by four or five people.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that that is not just the information that was asked, but if the Secretary of Agriculture had wanted to give the Congress the information to which it is entitled, he could have told us that, or otherwise he did not make investigation enough or did not know enough about his own business to be competent to be running it. Since I made this request—and I made it because I had information of some payments of large amounts—many others have come to light. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSION] disclosed some. Senator VANDENBERG has disclosed some. It is perfectly apparent to me that there is a desire on the part of the A. A. A. not to take the Congress and the people of the United States into its confidence in this matter, and that they have something to cover up. I believe that the Congress should assert its rights and get what it is entitled to. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to be helpful about this matter in getting at the truth, and I shall recite what I read yesterday about a gentleman who came before your committee and told the truth.

There was a man named Hagood,  
Who told the truth as he should;  
But for telling the truth  
He was banished, forsooth,  
So telling the truth don't pay good.

Mr. TABER. Well, I believe the people of the United States will insist on General Hagood receiving his rights and being restored to duty in the Army of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, frankly, if the Department of Agriculture wanted to be frank and square with the people of the United States and give them this information, they could do so, and do so at a very moderate expense. Let me say further it is apparent that this A. A. A. has been used for the purpose of making large payments to certain producers, away out of line, instead of being used as a matter of agricultural relief for the poor farmer. I do not believe the Department of Agriculture and the A. A. A. should be permitted longer to cover up their iniquities.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not also a fact that by limiting acreage and restricting production, thousands of sharecroppers

and tenant farmers in the South have been thrown out of employment and placed upon the relief rolls, whereas the absent landlord who lives in New York or New Jersey has received vast benefits?

Mr. TABER. More money than he could have gotten out of the farm by operating it, and he has thrown his own help on relief.

Mr. SHORT. I can corroborate that statement by saying that farmers south of my district have received as much as the land was worth, by not working it.

Mr. TABER. For 1 year?

Mr. SHORT. For 1 year.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Two southern universities, through their research departments, have found, after thorough investigation, that 5,000,000 sharecroppers have been placed on the relief rolls.

Mr. TABER. That is one of the ways in which the number of unemployed in this country has continued to rise.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman any definite information with reference to the story that is going around here that a Member of Congress received \$225,000 for curtailing production?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. KNUTSON. And that an insurance company received \$700,000?

Mr. TABER. Well, if that is the situation, the country ought to know it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a few moments. There is a tremendous interest in this country. I have seen editorials in many of the leading papers. They cannot understand, if this outfit over at the A. A. A. is playing the game with both hands on the table, why they do not come across and give the information to the public.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I think our friend from New York is the proper man to administer this whipping to Secretary Wallace, a Republican. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is a distinguished leader of the Republicans on his side of the House. The President of the United States has to depend upon agents to administer his program and to carry out his will. When his agents are not efficient they make a mess of administering. Unfortunately, instead of choosing a loyal, efficient Democrat, the President saw fit to select a leading Republican to put in charge of the Department of Agriculture, Henry Wallace, and I think the gentleman is the proper Republican to do the whipping. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. TABER. Now, the gentleman is just right in every respect, except that Henry Wallace is not a Republican. He has not voted for a Republican candidate for President, according to my information, in 15 years.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, look in Who's Who and the history of past national Republican conventions and you will find that Henry Wallace's whole family have been partisan Republicans back for generations, back to the time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary.

Mr. TABER. Henry Wallace is one of those fellows who was brought up by a good family, but who had more education than he had capacity to absorb, and has been a fluke. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. My colleague is quite right. Henry Wallace is now and has been a fluke.

Mr. TABER. I hope that just what little I have said on the actual facts as to what this sort of thing would cost and how long it would take will arouse Congress and the country to demand their rights to find out who is the beneficiary of the taxes that have been placed upon the people, and whether or not and to what extent and how enormously this proposition under the administration of Henry Wallace has been a racket. I believe it has been a racket right along.



Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. This is an open book, is it not, in all of the counties of the United States?

Mr. TABER. It should be.

Mr. PIERCE. It is today.

Mr. TABER. It should be, but it is not.

Mr. PIERCE. These checks went back to the local communities. It is an open book at Pendleton, Oreg., and every county where these checks went. What is your object, except political?

Mr. TABER. My object is to find out the truth, and we do not know the truth and we cannot get it the way the gentleman can. It is absolutely impossible.

Mr. PIERCE. You can communicate with the boards that handle these checks. It is all an open book. The gentleman is just making a political speech.

Mr. TABER. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PIERCE. It does not mean anything.

Mr. TABER. I refuse to yield further. It is the custom of those who desire to cover up their own iniquities to say that a man is playing politics when he wants to find out the truth. Now, that is the situation here. Let us find the truth. Let the politics fall where they may. If it falls on me, let it fall, but let us find the truth and do not try to dodge your responsibilities here in this House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

#### THE FLOOD IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of a speech I made on the air the other evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio address on the subject, The Flood in Connecticut, delivered on March 24, 1936, over the Yankee Network System, from Station WJSV.

I had intended to talk this evening on a subject which I have been studying for years, namely, the part which is played in economic activity by the small commercial enterprises of our Nation and the important contribution to reemployment and recovery which it is in their power to make.

I was putting the finishing touches to my talk last Friday around noon when a Washington paper was brought to me, shrieking this headline across the front page: "Hartford Inundated!" I was stunned. I grabbed for the telephone, frantically called my office in Hartford. The operator told me no calls could go through to Hartford for the rest of the day. "What about tomorrow?", I asked. "I can't promise that", was her reply. I waited no longer. I took the train to Hartford that night.

The next morning I looked out from the station platform on Asylum Street, one of the leading thoroughfares of the city. I saw something I never expected would meet my sight. Asylum Street, running by our beautiful capitol grounds, was a sea of water. Guests were leaving the Hotel Bond, our leading hostelry, in rowboats, which carried them directly to the station. I had to use planks to cross the street from the railroad station. Rain was pouring. There were no taxis. The great Bond Hotel stood as though it were a tall building set in the middle of a lake. I made my way to my office, which fortunately was not flooded. But as far as my eye could see the other end of Market Street was a canal. The old Brown School that I attended as a boy was surrounded completely by water. Men and women bewildered, knowing not what to do, passed to and fro, silent, sad. Business was at a standstill. Stores were closed. The electric power had gone out of commission. All lights were out. Homes that depended upon oil for heat were cold. There was no refrigeration. Elevators were not running. I had gone to Hartford, expecting to see water along the Connecticut River front but I never expected to find it covering the heart of the city.

Soldiers and policemen patrolled the streets. The fire department headquarters had been flooded. The engines and apparatus were moved from the headquarters and were filling the street close to my office. Across the street, the police station was crowded with hundreds appealing hopelessly that the police might do something about the flood. Mothers of children and babes in arms, fathers asking for doctors for dear ones who were ill from exposure and cold. I went to the State Armory where Adj. Gen. William F. Ladd was in command of the Army and Naval forces. There I was assigned a naval aide and provided with passes to take me by the lines that had been laid out for

the protection of the people and began a tour of the city and adjacent territory.

Down at the South Meadows were dikes, the building of which had been started by Samuel Colt back in 1854. They had withstood every flood, big and little. They had been supplemented by the best engineering skill obtainable. Saturday morning they were far under the swirling, rushing water. The South Meadows was a lake. The new sewage disposal plant, just completed by the metropolitan district commission was completely submerged. The Church of Good Shepherd had water almost to its roof. The famous Colt's Patent Firearms factory was half way submerged.

My naval aide and I got into a boat. Our boatman wound his way in and out cautiously. We had to be extra careful. There were the wires overhead which we must not touch for fear of their being charged. Water was running over land that had never before been submerged. We had to be careful also because of automobiles that were caught, fences, and low sheds under us.

The second story of a 16-apartment house was level with our boat at one point. We climbed into the house. In the top story we found furniture, bric-a-brac, bedding, all the goods of the tenants piled high in the hallways, in spare rooms, and on the stairways. In the hurry to save these goods there was much breakage. Upholstery was ripped and torn. The tenants had fled. There were hundreds of houses like that one.

Back to our boat, and farther out we rode. We came upon the shed of a brickyard that had come all the way down from Windsor, 10 miles up the river. There is grim humor in a brickyard's floating away, but to me it was stark tragedy. The owner's all was invested in that brickyard. We came upon tons of floating lumber which had been the property of a boyhood friend of mine. We came upon great gasoline-storage tanks which the floods had torn away from their foundations and sent hurtling down the river, ripping and tearing and destroying everything in their path. A Government cutter was doing great service in forcing these tanks up on to the ground where they might be anchored and kept from continuing in their path of destruction. Every store leading toward the Connecticut River, beginning with a few feet below Main Street, was submerged.

An automobile trip through the city brought me next to the municipal building, two sides of which were completely surrounded by water. The valuable records of many years had been taken out of the vaults and basement to save them from destruction. The mayor's office was open all night, where people sought refuge and help. I went down Morgan Street, the main thoroughfare leading to the million-dollar Memorial Bridge that spans the Connecticut. There I had to leave my car in order to proceed farther toward the bridge. We took a lifeboat provided by the Connecticut Navy Militia which was being used to ferry doctors and others on important business.

We rowed over the bridge where ordinarily we rode over in an automobile. We passed the great freight yards of the railroads. Hundreds of cars filled with perishable goods were almost completely submerged. I turned to the right and looked down Front Street, one of the important East Side business streets of Hartford. Every store was flooded, the tenements completely evacuated. The street was supposedly protected against floods by dikes built in connection with the Memorial Bridge. I am told that an owner of a small store gave a truckman and his assistants \$200 to move his stock to a place where he thought it would be safe. Overnight the water reached the supposedly safe storage and engulfed that also. On the crest of the Memorial Bridge I looked up and down the river. Here I was told that the records of the floods in the Connecticut River Valley kept since March 18, 1639, had reached their height on this day. There have been many great floods but never one approaching this.

We rowed among the houses of East Hartford. From the East Hartford side of the bridge to Church Corner, a distance of over a mile, the entire boulevard was completely covered by water. We stopped at the tallest building in that district, climbed a fire-escape ladder, and from the roof viewed a scene of devastation such as had never before been seen in that district.

I was amazed at the havoc wrought. Up the river, jammed against the Willimantic Railroad bridge, were whole houses that had been swept from their foundations into the river and were bumping against the railroad bridge, seriously endangering it.

Again, great oil tanks, battered, were floating down the river. A heavy stillness like the quiet of a desolate cemetery hung over everything. The only motion was that of the water. Here there was no human activity. I turned back. I had seen enough.

In Hartford, everywhere people stopped me, each with stories more horrible than the other. A mother with a babe on one arm was leading a child with the other hand, talking with a girl about 14. I heard the young girl say, "Perhaps my cousin can take you in." This is the plight of 10,000.

I was told of small businessmen and industrialists who suddenly had lost everything. Hopelessness was everywhere, yet there was a spirit of determination and courage which was thrilling. Friday night, Saturday night, Sunday night the city was in total darkness. There was no heat, no hot food, no hot water. We moved by flashlight and by candlelight.

That afternoon I attended a meeting in the Governor's office. There were gathered those men and women who always come forward in great crises, ready to give of themselves for their fellow-men who need their help. The American Red Cross, the health departments, the welfare departments, the United States Army were represented. Engineers, doctors, civic leaders, businessmen were there. We did not discuss the havoc, but instead what must now be done for relief and rehabilitation. Everyone was ready.



Everyone was anxious to do something. Other conferences were held, one at my own office. Among those who were present were Charles A. Goodwin, chairman of the metropolitan district commission; Roscoe Clark, engineer for the metropolitan district commission; Caleb Saville, city engineer; Judge George H. Day, chairman of the board of police commissioners; Gen. S. H. Wadhams, chairman of the State water commission; Judge Solomon Elsner, former corporation counsel for the city of Hartford; Maj. Mason J. Young, district engineer of the War Department, of Providence, R. I., who especially made the trip to Hartford and gave valuable counsel.

The one question asked by all was, What are you going to do to prevent another such catastrophe? Flood havoc can be prevented. When will America rise to her responsibility and take measures which will prevent and curb the devastation of floods?

I learned that one small hospital on the very day of high waters had taken in 41 patients in spite of the fact that the hospital was already overcrowded. I was told of the illness, the disease which was overtaking the people as the floodwaters began to recede. I was told of the lives that had been lost, the property and business ruined, of the people thrown out of work because their places of employment had been flooded out.

The necessity for coordinated, cooperative action in the way of relief was forcibly driven home. The value of the experience of the Federal relief agencies has been proven. No time is wasted in first investigating conditions. The emergency is met immediately. In certain parts of the country, even as I am talking, the flood has not reached its crest. But already in the areas where the flood has passed through, the forces of relief and rehabilitation are at work. The Red Cross and the Surplus Commodities Food Corporation are rushing to the stricken areas additional supplies of food, equipment, clothing, and bedding. Officials and employees of the relief agencies are already working in the stricken zones. Concerted and coordinated action from Washington is disseminating help throughout every area. Appeals for aid coming from every section of the country include many from men who during the past 12 months have been crying aloud against the relief that has been given the unfortunate by the Government. Today, finding themselves in a severe plight, their criticism against the humane activities of this Government have been silenced in their own plea for help from the floodwaters.

Flood devastation, like bank failures, like unemployment, has presented a serious and menacing recurring problem. Efforts to control it have been made since the beginning of time. Surveys of the great tributaries of our country have resulted in suggested flood-control projects, recognized as imperative by the engineers of this Nation, but which were not undertaken because of the refusal to spend the funds.

Thus countless projects for flood prevention which have been recommended were never undertaken. The momentary loss resulting from the present flood alone would have paid a great part of the cost of this prevention work. The loss of lives, health, homes, business, jobs, because business was ruined, is inestimable.

Every time a dollar was spent on flood prevention there were those who protested the spending of the money. Vast damage has been prevented in those areas where flood-control construction has been completed. But the big jobs, carefully worked out, have never been started.

It is unfortunate that it took this catastrophe to bring us all to a realization that something must be done to avoid, or at least to ameliorate, flood conditions in the future in the Connecticut Valley.

We must get at the root of the problem. Expensive dikes are not the solution. The splendid dike system in southern Hartford rose many feet above the level of any flood previously recorded. It succumbed to this one.

The problem must be met by prevention along the source streams throughout New England.

The Government engineers have already developed complete plans for the construction of 33 storage reservoirs to be located along the Connecticut River and tributary streams in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Connecticut. These reservoirs would greatly reduce the peril of future floods. Plans are so far advanced that work could be begun immediately upon the construction of 10 of these reservoirs.

The engineers of the War Department have found that these reservoirs may be operated so as to reconcile the interests of flood control and power. On the one hand flood devastation would be prevented and curbed; on the other hand additional force would be given to power operations. Sanitary and health conditions would be improved.

The 33 reservoirs could be constructed at an estimated cost of \$43,000,000, which includes the cost of acquiring the land. To construct the 10 reservoirs suggested as the initial part of the program would cost approximately \$13,393,000, which sum also includes the acquisition of the land.

According to the recommendation made by the War Department, it is suggested that the Government pay one-half the cost of constructing the reservoirs, or \$5,000,000. It is up to the States to do the rest.

I hope conferences will soon be held by representatives of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Connecticut to form a compact and agree as to the division of the cost.

But in the event that there is likely to be a delay because of prolonged discussion and argument, because of disagreement as to the share of the expense, I hope that the Federal Government will assume the entire expense of constructing these initial 10 reservoirs, plans for which have been fully completed.

The property damage alone in New England resulting from this flood would more than pay for the entire cost of constructing the 33 reservoirs, which have been recommended by the engineers of the War Department. The loss of lives, homes, business, employment, health, the cost of rehabilitation of property which wasn't entirely damaged, the inconvenience and terror to which the people were subjected—these cannot be counted in dollars.

In this day and age, with the science of engineering so perfected that floods can be controlled, there is no excuse for the havoc which is being wrought in our land today. We cannot stop the rush of waters. We can stop or at least ameliorate the devastation that they wreak. It is up to the people to demand that flood-prevention work be immediately undertaken. I call upon you, the people of New England, to demand that this be done. When the Governors, the legislators, and other officers of your State find that you, the people, demand an end of floods, there will be an end of floods.

It has unfortunately remained for this catastrophe to overtake approximately one-third of the States of the Union, the most populous States, for the Nation to awake startlingly to the fact that we may no longer put off the construction of reservoirs, dams, and dikes, to insofar as we can combat the force of nature, keep our rivers from turning into forces of destruction.

#### MEMORIAL EXERCISES

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 467

*Resolved*, That on Tuesday, April 21, 1936, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials, under the provisions of clause 40-A of rule XI. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall be given the privilege of extending their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At the conclusion of the proceedings the Speaker shall call the House to order, and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman going to talk about?

Mr. MAVERICK. I am going to talk about when we ought to adjourn. I am not going to offer the privileged resolution to which I referred earlier. This will save time. I should like to talk about 2 minutes. This will result in the saving of about 40 minutes for a roll call. I am giving a discount of time there of about 98 percent.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I object. I think the gentleman has made his speech twice this morning.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman has some particular reason, I trust he will not object. This is a privileged resolution. The gentleman from Texas, of course, has the right to offer it. It will save a good deal of time if the gentleman from Michigan does not object.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman from Texas has any right to stand up here and say he is going to have a roll call if he does not get unanimous consent.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to be lectured by a Republican. I did not say that. What I said was that "I am not going to offer" the resolution. But since I cannot offer a short explanation, I will offer the resolution for the Record to show we ought to adjourn in a reasonable time.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution. I have as much right to offer it as has any other Member, and the gentleman from Michigan knows I have this right.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAVERICK submits the following concurrent resolution:

#### "House Concurrent Resolution 46

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Monday, the 11th day of May 1936; that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die."*



Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to lay the resolution on the table.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present and challenge the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it; but I am going to offer the resolution next week.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is withdrawn.

The motion to lay the resolution on the table was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOME MERCHANTS ARE OUR NEIGHBORS AND FRIENDS—CONGRESS MUST PROTECT THEIR INTERESTS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on legislation reported out by the Judiciary Committee known as the Patman-Utterback bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we have at last gotten favorable action on our home merchants bill, H. R. 8442, introduced June 11, 1935, by our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. The Judiciary Committee has just ordered a favorable report on it, which will be prepared promptly and in a few days filed by our friend from Iowa [Mr. UTTERBACK].

#### ONCE UPON A TIME

I can remember through the days of long ago, when our home merchants were the leading, substantial citizens in our towns and cities. Their money was deposited in local banks. Their profits were invested in their home town. They were actively identified with the local churches, fraternal lodges, and civic associations. All of their employees were local citizens thoroughly identified with the best interests, progress, and growth of the community.

#### CROWDED OUT ONE BY ONE

Then monopolies began to operate. The retail business became organized and controlled by officials of high finance in New York and other large cities. They had unlimited means. They could buy in trainload lots. They could afford to sell certain staples far below what same cost the local merchant, and it was only a question of time when many of the home merchants were forced out of business. One by one they had to quit. Many lost their investments. Many were ruined. They were supplanted by strangers. Only a few have been able to keep their doors open. By passing this bill, Congress will grant them lawful protection. Congress will give the home merchant another chance. Congress will then say to monopolies "Let our home merchants alone; you cannot run them out of business."

#### ECONOMIC CRISES IN GREECE AND ROME

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the depression, and to include therein a letter from Dr. Arthur Patch McKinley which I found extremely interesting and which I should like to have published in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include the letter to which he has referred?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have had in my hands a memorandum on the methods used by certain ancient states in facing economic crises. I have always been an interested student of history and this material appealed to me from the historical standpoint, also, as of practical value in our present economic difficulties. Our so-called "depression" has gone on now 6 years, without the discovery of any real remedy, and it is my opinion that we may as well turn to history and study what was

accomplished by the Romans, people so like us in many ways. The very striking parallel between Roman civilization and our own is brought out most effectively in Ferrero's History of Rome. It is, of course, essential that in any comparison we should note the difference between a civilization built on slavery and one built on machinery. The difference, however, is not so great as to destroy the value of comparative study of these crises.

Both ancient countries had an economic structure top-heavy with debt. The author of the memorandum to which I refer is Dr. Arthur Patch McKinley, professor in the University of California, at Los Angeles, and author of that delightful volume on Cicero, entitled "Letters of a Roman Gentleman." In that book he presented the difficulties that came to Rome from her financial dealings with the "allies", basing his comment on that experience of Rome. He suggested that if our own State Department and foreign investment bankers were not careful about placing their foreign loans, we might have the same experience Rome had. That warning was written in 1926.

The author is convinced that what we need is some immediate action to bring about a proper relation between the debts and capital structure of our country. I strongly recommend study of the provisions made by Caesar allowing interest payments to be credited on principal, and for real property valuation in liquidations. Whatever may be the opinions of my colleagues on the questions of inflation and deflation, I feel sure that this memorandum by a student of ancient history will be found entertaining and suggestive. I am not ready to go full length with my friend when he suggests that we knock off 40 percent of obligations, but it makes one reflect on the possible necessities we face unless we accept the fact of a changed economic order. I therefore insert it as part of my remarks, and ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD with this brief statement.

#### MEMORANDUM ON ECONOMIC CRISES IN GREECE AND ROME

MAY 11, 1933.

You suggest that the experience of Greece and Rome may throw some light on the problem of what to do when the debt situation in a country has come to the place that the very life of the nation is at stake. In reply to this question I refer you to the legislation of Solon at Athens and to the Licinian laws of Rome, 377-357 B. C., and to the financial legislation of Caesar in 48 B. C.

By way of preface, a word about the social setting for these several occasions will help. At Athens, owing to wars and debt, conditions had become so perilous that all classes turned to Solon and gave him carte blanche to handle the situation. Rome of the fourth century was an heir to the social collapse that followed close on the expulsion of the Etruscan kings in 509 B. C. The Etruscans had made Rome into a thriving metropolis. With the destruction of their industrial edifice by the restoration of the noncommercially minded Latins, great numbers of citizens found themselves without any means of support. This condition obtained for nearly 150 years, with a gradual readjustment of the city to the new economic point of view until Rome reverted to its former status (before the incoming of the Etruscans) and became hardly more than a country village. Meanwhile the less favored classes kept pressing for social and political opportunity. In successive stages they finally won the latter, and came in a position to claim the former. Then a champion of the plebs arose in the form of the Tribune Licinius, who in 367 B. C. put through the bills referred to above.

Caesar's legislation of 48 B. C. was an outcome of an orgy of speculation following upon the Second Punic War and resulting in more than 100 years of deflation, most of which was one long agony of social struggles with the attendant phenomenon of crushing debt. At last, affairs muddled through into Caesar's dictatorship and his reform measures.

With this preliminary discussion in mind, we now pass on to the remedies applied to these intolerable conditions. Solon solved the problem by canceling all debts secured either by mortgage or personal security. He also inflated the currency so that the mina of 73 drachma now had 100. There is some dispute as to how this ancient tradition of Solon's financial reforms should be interpreted; but suffice it to say that he found a debt-ridden country and, if we may include the reforms of Pisistratus a few years later, left it so well reorganized from the debt point of view that in all the centuries to come his descendants did not have recourse to any further impairing of contracts or to tampering with the money standard.

At Rome, the Licinian laws of 377-357 provided that the principal of a loan should be reduced by the interest that had been already paid. Consequently (352 B. C.) a commission of five was appointed to liquidate the mass of outstanding accounts. This commission arranged for the payment of debts from public funds, substituting the state, with proper precautions, for the private



creditor. They also paid off creditors with the goods of debtors, but took care that such goods should be taken at a fair valuation. Caesar, in his reorganization of finances, also allowed interest already paid to count against the principal. Debtors could also liquidate by handing over their real property to the creditors, and that, too, not at the vastly depreciated current value, but at the rate obtaining before the war. He arranged for arbitration in cases of dispute. To force money into circulation he allowed no one to hold more than \$2,400 in cash. Caesar did this in 11 days.

Incidentally, it may be remarked that Sparta once was forced to a repudiation of debts. This was accomplished through a division of land among the people, just as the French did after the Revolution. It should also be noted that all these solutions of social bankruptcies were followed, whether in consequence or not, by long periods of great social prosperity. If it had not been for Solon's reforms, the Athenian democracy with its 100 years of transcendent glory could never have been. The 150 years following the Licinian legislation was the great period of the Roman Republic, just as likewise the 200 years subsequent to Caesar were the most prosperous centuries of the Roman Empire. Sparta prospered under the laws of Lycurgus for 500 years.

It is also interesting to note the modernity of some of the preceding measures: Inflation of currency, Government credit for refunding, commissions for execution and arbitration, financial dictatorships, post-war deflations as causes of social bankruptcies, and antihoarding provisions.

It is a great temptation for the student of ancient history to apply these experiences of the ancients to our own predicament and suggest that we might take the economic bull by the horns and knock off at one stroke 40 percent, say, of all obligations, mortgages, accounts, bonds, including war debts, life insurance, and building-and-loan-association obligations incurred before the crash in 1929. Besides, why not invoke the principle of caveat faenerator (let the lender beware) and require him to liquidate the property under lien at its value when the loan was made?

A word or two about the advantages of this plan: The immediate need at this time is to set millions of men to work. Knock off two-fifths of a firm's obligations and it will be in a position to start its wheels going. Properties too heavily obligated should be turned over to the bondholders, on the basis of the appraised value at time of loan. The new owners would no longer be a drag on industry but would perforce put their property to work.

Anyone familiar with the plans of the administration will recognize that the aims of the ancient and modern legislatures are similar, to relieve industry from the burden of parasitic wealth. If the inflation of the dollar can immediately result in a large reduction in debt, well and good; but it may turn out that it will be about as hard to get hold of an inflated dollar as of the deflated one. If so, precious time will have been lost and it will be fearful to contemplate what is ahead of a social order that has 75 percent of its wealth in the form of vested securities. As to any scruples about the sacredness of contract, one must recall the proverb that necessity knows no law, and also remind himself of the fact that, if he had died in 1928, nobody would have eked out the pitiful pittance (in buying power) the insurance companies would have paid his widow for the good dollars he had deposited with them throughout the early years of the century. Besides, a wise man will be satisfied with a 60-cent dollar that will buy a dollar's worth of stuff or more rather than to take what he will get if millions of men don't go to work pretty soon.

ARTHUR PATCH MCKINLAY.

#### THE ANTILOBBYING BILL

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 462.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11663, a bill to require reports of receipts and disbursements of certain contributions, to require the registration of persons engaged in attempting to influence legislation, to prescribe punishments for violation of this act, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this rule will make in order the bill H. R. 11663, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and referred to usually as the antilobbying bill. I do not care to discuss the rule, which is the usual form of open rule, provides 2 hours of general debate, and leaves the bill open to amendment.

I want to say just a little something about the background of the proposed legislation. This bill is in a way a part of the report of the Committee on Rules in response to a resolution at the last session directing it to make certain investigations of the activities of so-called lobbyists around the Capitol last summer when utility legislation was under consideration. Pursuant to that resolution the committee met and held hearings for many days.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Will the gentleman yield so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

#### AUTHORITY OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file reports on the bill (H. R. 11968) relating to the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make rehabilitation loans for the repair of damages caused by floods or other catastrophes, and for other purposes, and the bill (H. R. 12014) relating to the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make rehabilitation loans for the repair of damages caused by floods or other catastrophes, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### THE ANTILOBBYING BILL

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the investigation undertaken by the Rules Committee of lobbying activities is not widely different, according to my observation, from other similar investigations which have taken place from time to time. It is not easy for an investigating committee to get anything very definite, concrete, or satisfactory about lobbying activities under present conditions. These sporadic investigations which are made from time to time may result in some temporary good, but they are expensive and cumbersome and seldom result in the punishment of any violator of what may be right and proper in that respect.

The Rules Committee felt that some permanent and wise legislation should be enacted by the Congress which would tend within itself to retard these activities in the future and hereafter enable investigating committees to secure with a great deal less expense and a great deal less trouble, and in a great deal shorter time, much more concrete, direct, and satisfactory information as to what does take place and to provide a means of punishment for wrongdoers. Therefore this bill was introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Rules Committee, and has been made a part of the report of the Rules Committee. It has since been passed upon by the Judiciary Committee and is now pending before the House.

It has just two objectives. Certainly no member of the Rules Committee questions the right of any citizen or any interest that may be affected by proposed legislation to appear and be heard. That is a high privilege of every American citizen and interest that should not be prescribed or abridged in any way. But as the Members well know certain things have happened. People who advocate or oppose the passage of important legislation come to Washington, set up an establishment, make such contacts as they may be able to make around the Capitol here, and then proceed to make an appeal to the country through propaganda of every description, in which they are not overly particular about the statement of facts. They thereby try to make the "worse appear the better reason." They try to create the impression here in the Capitol that the vocal minority is really the silent majority. This bill deals with both angles of these activities.

Under the terms of this measure the lobbyist who comes here must register under oath. He must state by whom he is employed, how much he receives in the way of salary and expense accounts, and in what manner he spends these funds. Any organization which collects money for the prin-



cial purpose of going out and putting on one of these propaganda campaigns by which they hope to stir up enough fuss to confuse the representatives of the people in the Capitol as to what is the status of public opinion, have to file reports showing how much money it collects, and from whom, when the collection of that money is for the principal purpose of that kind of an activity.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not in any way prohibit lobbying. It certainly does not prohibit or seek to proscribe any American citizen or interest in an appeal to the public; but it does undertake to bring lobbying activities to the point where the Representatives of the people in Congress may see what is going on, whether here at the Capitol or by way of appeal to the country at large. This is accomplished in such a way that the American people may understand from what source the appeal comes, what it costs, who contributes to it, and what the objective is. It does not undertake to prohibit these activities, but it does seek to draw them out into the broad light of day in order that we may see and the public may see just what is being done.

Count Leo Tolstoy was a wise man. He was a private citizen, but the world made a beaten path to his door. In one of his great books in which he deals with some of the major movements of men and of nations, a book completed in his older days, he opens one of the concluding chapters with the question: "What is the force that moves nations?" Bringing into play his great analytical mind and drawing upon the great fund of information acquired by observation and research during his long life, he answers the question a few chapters later by saying, "The force that moves nations is the will of the masses." That pronouncement of this great and wise man is but another way of saying that public opinion is king. In this country of ours, so organized as to be peculiarly responsible to the will of the people, public opinion is king, and there is no more important question before the country today than the necessity for a sound, intelligent, wise, and well-balanced public opinion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does no more than to pull back the smoke screen and lay all these activities out in the light of day so that the American people may see and form intelligent and sound opinion, and that we in Washington may have no smoke in our eyes when we undertake as best we can to interpret their will and purposes. [Applause.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH].

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise either to oppose the rule or to oppose the bill. I trust that if the bill is enacted into law it may do some good, although I am not very sanguine of that.

The bill has two major objects. The first is to compel all persons or organizations that seek to influence legislation and to elect or defeat candidates for Congress or Members for reelection in order to influence legislation, either to advance or oppose legislative propositions, to keep account of all the moneys they collect for this purpose and all the moneys they expend for such purpose and make reports to the Clerk of the House of Representatives to be filed in his office. In other words, it imposes similar duties upon persons or organizations that seek to influence legislation as the Corrupt Practices Act imposes upon persons or organizations that engage in attempts to elect Members of Congress.

I think insofar as organizations influencing legislation is concerned, this provision will have about the same effect as the Corrupt Practices Act has had in political campaigning in this country.

The other provision is that lobbyists who come to Washington to establish contacts for the purpose of influencing legislation are to register and state by whom they are employed, what their compensation is, and so forth.

The trouble with this provision is that it may catch a practicing lawyer here in Washington who has been retained to engineer a private claim through the Congress, or some-

body of that kind, while it excludes all the important lobbyists concerning whom all the to-do has been about in the last year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? That is a rather important statement the gentleman has made.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In what way does this bill exclude from its operations the important lobbyists to whom the gentleman has referred?

Mr. LEHLBACH (reading):

Any person who shall accept employment for any consideration to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of any pending or proposed legislation or appropriation by the Congress of the United States.

This applies to that kind of individual and no one else. Now, every lobbyist who has been belabored here, justly or unjustly, is not within this classification. Hopson was not employed for the purpose of influencing legislation. No general counsel of a big corporation is employed for such a purpose. It may be incident to his employment. And the person who organizes and gets contributions from persons interested or persons gullible enough to send in contributions and then is here in Washington and purports to advocate or to oppose something in the interest of his contributors is not employed for that purpose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly for another question?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If what the gentleman states is true with respect to a proper interpretation of this bill, then it certainly seems to me that if that type of serious omission has been made in the provisions of the bill, it should be corrected by an amendment, if such an amendment is possible.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I do not know how such an amendment can be drawn without infringing upon perfectly legitimate rights.

I just wanted to make these two comments on the bill. I do not see any reason why anybody should get excited about it at all. There is no reason to oppose it, but it is not going to do what some may hope it will do.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is aware that in the time the Rules Committee spent on this measure, and we spent a good deal of time on it, we were of a fairly unanimous opinion on the necessity of the bill.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes; I have no opposition to the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We did intend to reach the Hopsons and the Robinsons and the other people who have been around here lobbying on legislation.

Mr. LEHLBACH. You reach them by section 6 of the earlier sections, but so far as their personal representation here is concerned, and making them disclose their purposes, and so forth, the presidents of utility holding corporations, general counsels of big corporations, and commanders of veterans' organizations are not people employed for the purpose of lobbying. Their representation of the interests of their organizations is incident to their executive positions in such organizations, and they do not come under the classification of people specifically employed for such purpose at all.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. FULLER. If the bill would exempt all those the gentleman has described—labor organizations, mail-carrier organizations, Federal employees, the Legion, and all veteran organizations, and if it is going to also exempt the officers of the big corporations—whom is it going to reach?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Perhaps an attorney who has been retained to help through a private claim.

Mr. FULLER. Can the gentleman name any particular one he has known around here lately that would be reached? Can the gentleman describe a case where it would reach anybody who has come around here lately trying to influence Congress?



Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I will name one, if the gentleman will yield to me to answer.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It would reach this fellow Smith, who was lobbying on the Pettengill bill, and if the Members of Congress had known he was a lobbyist by reason of his registration in the Clerk's office they would not have been inveigled into attending his party.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I do not know the terms or conditions under which Mr. Smith was here.

Mr. FULLER. Did not he claim he was attorney for the firm he represented?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I do not know; but the mere fact that he was here in Washington would not make him an attorney employed for that purpose.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman think the bill is broad enough to include the old-age-pension plan which is now being investigated?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Not as far as registering lobbyists, but as far as the accounting it does.

Here is one thing in the bill that I want to point out, and particularly to those who are specifically backing the legislation.

In describing the organizations who will have to file accounts of their receipts and expenditures, it was intended to exclude all those who already, insofar as the election of Members are concerned, must file such statements under the Corrupt Practices Act, and for that reason it excluded political committees as defined in said act.

(The time of Mr. LEHLBACH having expired, he was given 5 minutes more.)

Mr. LEHLBACH. The provisions of this act will not apply to any committee now required by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to file such report.

That means that the Republican, Democratic, and Socialist political parties or political committees do not have to file expense accounts over again because they are taken care of in the Corrupt Practices Act. But that act says that a political committee includes any committee, and so forth, other than a duly organized State or local committee of a party. For instance, branches of the Democratic or Republican Party in a State, county, or municipality, or a congressional district are not required each one of them to flood the Clerk's office of the House of Representatives with an account of their receipts and expenditures. So that they are excepted from the definition of political committees.

In this bill you except political committees as defined in the act. Consequently the local committees are included in the bill under consideration, which means that every county and congressional political committee must file with the Clerk of the House.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. That is a complicated matter and was overlooked. There is an amendment contemplated to cure that.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I was going to suggest an amendment that would cure it, providing that the act shall not apply to those committees excepted in the Corrupt Practices Act.

The amendment I intend to propose is as follows: On page 5, line 10, after the word "act", insert the words "and except an organized State or local committee of a political party."

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would it not be a good idea to have it provide for a duly legal committee, organized legally, a recognized committee?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I am using the language of the Corrupt Practices Act in suggesting this amendment. I refer to the language in the Corrupt Practices Act used to except those local committees from the workings of the Corrupt Practices Act. The point is that what is in the Corrupt Practices Act should be excluded in this bill, and this bill takes in everything that is excluded in the Corrupt Practices Act, but the local branches of a national political party should be excluded in both instances. For that reason I am offering the

amendment. As far as the language is concerned, it is always safe to use the language of a law instead of trying to improve upon it.

Mr. KNUTSON. What is the gentleman's construction of subsection (c) of section 6 on page 6?

Mr. LEHLBACH. It means any organization, for instance, the Townsend organization, that seeks to influence Members of Congress to vote for a bill incorporating the Townsend plan and threatens to defeat Members who refuse to accede to their directions. That brings them within subsection (c) of section 6—

To influence, directly or indirectly, the election or defeat of any candidate for an elective Federal office.

They have to show where they get their money and to show for what purpose and how they are spending it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I want some personal information with reference to this bill. Would this prevent an organization back in a district writing a Member urging or opposing legislation?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I should not think so.

Mr. MICHENER. For instance, I hold in my hand a notice that was sent out by an organization to many citizens of my district. This notice contains much misinformation. This was forwarded to me by one of the recipients of the notice. It is as follows:

Urgent! Urgent! Urgent!

We are informed Michigan Congressman Hon. EARL C. MICHENER opposing action on Robinson-Patman bill in present form. Also trying to amend bill to make it worthless. Suggest you write or wire him today demanding the support bill in present form. Address him at Washington, D. C. Get all merchants in other lines to write or wire him. Understand bill would be on floor of Congress except for MICHENER and a few others. Don't mince words. Let the gentleman know your attitude toward his present opposition. Act now! Passage of this bill is new hope for small-business men.

Mr. LEHLBACH. What is the organization that sent this?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not care to mention that, but there is much misinformation in that card. Would this bill affect a notice of that kind?

Mr. LEHLBACH. It depends upon the organization that sends out such a notice.

Mr. MICHENER. Say, it was a retail organization? I do not want to do anything to prevent my constituents from communicating with me.

Mr. LEHLBACH. If it were a wholesale grocers' organization or a wholesale drug organization, it would not apply for the simple reason that it describes an organization—

The principal purpose of which is to aid in the accomplishment of the following purposes:

The enactment or defeat of any legislation or appropriation, etc. To influence directly or indirectly the election or defeat of any candidate for any elective Federal office.

An organization that is permanent in character and looks out, generally, for the welfare of those in a particular line of business, just because it advocates or proposes to try to influence specific Members of Congress to advocate or oppose a particular legislation, does not come within the provisions of the bill. The major purpose of such an organization is not to defeat or further specific legislation. But an organization like the Townsend organization, which is organized for the purpose of passing specific legislation, would clearly come under it.

I would suggest that, with the amendment I propose, I see no reason for opposing the bill. I hope it accomplishes in a measure what its authors expect.

Mr. KNUTSON. How about Father Coughlin's organization? Would that be classified the same as the Townsend organization?

Mr. LEHLBACH. In my judgment, it would, because it exists for the purpose of influencing legislation, not specifically, but generally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].



Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I spoke in reference to this bill. Since then the Committee on the Judiciary has reported the bill after having made certain amendments to it. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] has raised a serious question, but I think he has overstated the case. When he says that most of the lobbying is carried on by the individual himself, he overlooks the fact that the evidence before the investigating committee shows that these corporations and utility associations acted almost invariably through lobbyists.

Hopson was acting through a paid lobbyist whom he had stationed in the city of Washington and who represented him for all purposes and to all intents. The same was true of Smith. The same was true of Magill, and the same was true of Mr. Cramer. I think you will find very few instances of these utility magnates actually lobbying themselves or contacting Members of Congress. However, this amendment can be strengthened by including not only those who usually accept employment for a consideration but those who are paid directly or indirectly for such purposes, so as to include the attorney of any corporation or any utility concern who, although he is paid a regular salary, devotes a portion of his time to lobbying.

Of course, the intent and purpose of the bill is to reach that class of professional lobbyists who prey upon the credulity of businessmen in this country. There is a type of lobbyist who advertises the fact that it is necessary to keep some paid experts with political influence in the city of Washington to influence legislation. Those professional lobbyists are engaged in a character of racketeering. There are many business individuals and groups who think it is necessary to maintain in this city those whose primary occupation is presumably to influence the course of legislation. They succeed in creating the impression that they have numerous contacts in the city. They make it a point to form the acquaintance of Members of the House and the Senate, so that when in company with their employers they can address Members of the House or the Senate. That condition has steadily grown worse not only in the Capitol but in some of the State legislatures. If it were not for the business of the lobbyists in some State capitals, the hotels would be compelled to close down.

Now, whether or not we can expand this bill so as to include all people who are seeking to influence legislation is a matter for the Congress to decide. It certainly is the right of every citizen, of every individual, of every business concern, to present his or her views to the Congress of the United States, and there should be no disposition to curtail or abridge that right. Therefore, whatever amendments are offered, we should bear constantly in mind that the farthest we can go is to reach that type of professional lobbyist who is preying upon the credulity and ignorance of the country and who seeks to bring into disrepute the Congress of the United States, because there are many people who believe that legislation is materially influenced by paid lobbyists.

This bill not only seeks to make those lobbyists register and to give to the country all of the information in regard to their employment and in regard to their salary, so that it will be available, not only to the Congress but likewise to the country at large, but it also seeks to reach those associations and those groups who are soliciting funds or receiving funds for the purpose of influencing legislation or for the purpose of bringing about the election or defeat of candidates for office. It was my hope that the bill could contain a provision that would reach not only general elections but would likewise compel those associations and groups to disclose their activities in regard to primary elections. But evidently, under the Newberry case, where the Supreme Court held that Congress had no jurisdiction to legislate in regard to any primary election and that that was a matter wholly without the scope of congressional authority, the Committee on the Judiciary decided that it could not reach that type of political activity. It is most unfortunate that we are unable to do so, because in many States nomination in the primary is equivalent to election,

and many States have no laws governing this matter, and some States, like the State of Texas, have ineffective laws, with the result that these organizations can influence the nomination of a candidate for office in some States without having to disclose that fact, whereas in other States, where the election is the important thing, they will be compelled to disclose their activities.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. We have had State campaigns for many years, especially the last few years, where candidates for office who never earned a fee of over \$1,000 in their lives up to the time they ran for some important State office can run for office and spend two or three hundred thousand dollars to be elected.

Mr. DIES. Of course, that is a matter of public knowledge in Texas. I do not know how it is in other States, but it is a matter that we have seen in Texas with our own eyes. In fact, we have seen men run for State offices of the State of Texas who never made over \$4,000 in their lives, and who have spent \$100,000 or \$200,000 in behalf of their campaign, with an army of paid assistants, with radio hook-ups, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. McFARLANE. Further in regard to the gentleman's statement regarding the Newberry case, in Texas, as in many other States, election in the primary is equivalent to election to office. We should enact legislation that will adequately cover the situation just discussed.

Mr. DIES. I think this bill could contain a provision providing for nominations, in spite of the Newberry case, on this theory, that this bill is not directed at the candidate. It is directed at these Nation-wide organizations that are formed for the primary purpose of influencing the nomination or defeat of a candidate for office. Upon that theory I cannot understand why we could not insert in the bill a provision that would include primary nominations.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I will tell the gentleman why it cannot be put in there. If the gentleman will read the Newberry case, he will find that the authority of Congress in dealing with party organizations is not in existence at all.

Mr. DIES. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. The only authority that the Congress has is derived from section 4 of article I of the Constitution. In the Newberry case the Court had that question squarely before it. It would be a futile effort on the part of Congress to attempt to regulate primary elections. This is a matter wholly within the province of the State.

Mr. DIES. I agree with the gentleman in regard to the holding in the Newberry case, except there is this distinction, that the Newberry case dealt with the candidate himself under a law requiring him to do certain things. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman will read the decision carefully, he will find it holds as I have indicated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE].

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUDLOW). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the purposes to be served by this kind of legislation. I think Congress has neglected far too long to bring in adequate legislation to require paid lobbyists and those who exert influence upon Congress to disclose this confidential information the Members of Congress are entitled to have in order properly to evaluate the reasons back of these lobbyists and others appearing here to influence legislation. I say, therefore, that this bill is certainly a step in the right direction and while it seems to me, as has been pointed out by several other Members, that some of the provisions of the pending measure are rather vague, indefinite, uncertain, and it is doubtful whether or not it will compel even some



of the superlobbyists, such as Mr. Hopson and others who have been in the forefront in the matter of lobbying before Congress in recent times, to register. I think we ought to amend it wherever needed and make it an airtight bill that will apply to everyone who comes before Congress who for any kind of consideration comes for the purpose of influencing legislation, so we shall get a complete background of the person and their reasons for trying to influence legislation.

No honest person ought for a minute to object to giving a complete disclosure of all information as to why he is here trying to influence legislation, and certainly all the crooks ought to be required to give this information so the Congress can properly look at the background and understand the reason prompting their action.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does this mean that representatives of veterans' organizations who are here for legislative purposes, and representatives of farm bureaus who are here for legislative purposes would also have to register?

Mr. McFARLANE. I doubt it under this bill as it is drawn, but I think they ought to. I think we ought to amend this bill and enact a law that will require all such organizations to register. I think we ought to treat them all alike. Then the Congress can properly look at their background and credentials, see how much money they are collecting and spending, and what their motives are.

I offered legislation of this type while serving in the Senate of Texas. I even went so far in the legislation I offered as to propose that the members of the legislature, the house and senate, be required to register and disclose full information as to any fees or anything of value they had received directly or indirectly while serving in the Legislature of the State of Texas.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. DIES. What success did the gentleman have in the State senate along this line?

Mr. McFARLANE. They threatened to impeach me and throw me out of the senate. Down in Texas I put them on record, and you will find officials holding high office in Texas today who voted against that resolution.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. DIES. We heard a great many promises in that State about driving the lobbyists out of the Capitol, in the last State campaign. Does the gentleman know whether any progress has been made along this line in Texas?

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes; we in Texas all remember that the special-interest lobbyists, who have controlled legislation in Texas for years, were the one big issue in the last Governor's race. Our present Governor made this the real issue of his campaign. He recommended that such legislation be enacted, but the legislature refused to pass such legislation, and the lobbyists still rule Texas. Back in the early twenties they passed a resolution requiring these lobbyists to register, but after the first session the lobbyists stole the register and threw it away. [Laughter.] Since that time we have been unable to enact any legislation requiring the lobbyists to register. Somehow or other the special interests in Texas have completely controlled and dominated the situation, so much so that we have never been able even to require the setting up of any kind of an adequate State regulatory commission to regulate the utility rates.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee, following its investigation, as directed by the House, of the utility lobby, has given a great deal of thought and attention to this matter. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr.

SMITH] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] have been especially industrious in working out a proposal which the Rules Committee endorses in its report on the lobby investigation.

It is not extravagant to say that countless millions were expended on the utility lobby. The Associated Gas & Electric Co. confessed to expending nearly \$1,000,000, and Mr. Hopson, of that company, testified there were about 19 or 20 companies, equally as large as or larger than his company, and that in his opinion they spent as much as his company did, if not more; so it may fairly be said that the stupendous sum of \$20,000,000 was spent, and, of course, as usual, with no effect.

I have never seen any effect a lobbyist ever had in Washington, but they are, at the same time, a nuisance to the Members. They claim to do what they never can do, and they collect money from organizations and people back home by deceiving the people as to their influence, which is nil. In my opinion, the janitor of the building has as much influence as any lobbyist who ever appeared in Washington, including the "boiled shirt" lawyers from my city and elsewhere, who often receive fees as high as \$250,000. [Applause.]

Information was conveyed to me recently that one of the lobbyists in Washington who lobbies for a number of matters was opposed to the bill because, as he stated, "if you have to register, nobody will hire you." If that is what this bill is going to accomplish, all Members ought to be for it. Why, when the utility bill was being considered on the floor of this House, the Members had difficulty getting into the Chamber. The lobbyists were out in the lobby in large numbers. There was one fellow from Ohio calling out the Members through that east door and there were lobbyists clogging the entrance to the Speaker's lobby. If this bill has no more effect than to keep these leeches away from us so that we may walk through the corridors of the Capitol, it is well worth while passing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not interfere with anyone appearing before a committee. That is specifically exempted. It does reach these organizations which collect from gullible people huge sums of money to influence the passage or defeat of legislation and to influence the election or defeat of candidates for Congress. This bill is a supplement to the Corrupt Practices Act, which pertains to elections for Members of Congress. Under that act, every candidate must file his return. This bill will require these organizations and individuals mentioned to register and file returns showing how much they have spent.

There is such a thing around here as "universal lobbyists." For instance, when the utility bill was in here for consideration, the utilities called in all the standing lobbyists and put them to work, no matter what organizations they usually represented. They had a universal lobby here, and they did not miss many lobby representatives of these other organizations. Even the lobbyists for charitable organizations were put on the pay roll of the utilities. Now, that situation, of course, is at least an annoyance.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does the gentleman believe this bill will go to the extent of reaching certain public relations people and the expenditures of large corporations, which have included money under miscellaneous items for this purpose? Will this bill require an accurate accounting from those organizations and individuals so that we may judge what influence they are exerting, if any?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Offhand I could not say, but I hope it does. This bill, of course, is a start in the right direction. We must do something to deter lobbying. It will, we hope, have a deterring influence. I have some sympathy with the point raised by the gentleman from New Jersey as to whether it will cover people who are not actually "employed." Our committee and the Judiciary Committee sat in conference together and jointly we gave some thought to that problem. If a start is made by making everybody employed who comes here trying to influence legislation go into the Clerk's office



and sign the book there and then every 3 months file an account of his expenditures, and so forth, we will have done something worth while to dissipate this idea which exists throughout the country that these people can come here and influence Congress. Of course, they never did and never will.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say that I am in full accord with the evil that this bill seeks to reach. I am in favor of the bill because when it comes back for the final vote some of the provisions, now too broad, will be eliminated. I want to ask the gentleman if there is anything in this proposed legislation which would require a Member of Congress who introduces a bill, then floods the country with propaganda in order to get organizations to threaten Members of Congress if they do not support his legislation, to be included under this bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Unfortunately, not.

Mr. LAMNECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LAMNECK. I would like to know whether this bill covers, say, representatives of the administration that may be in power or any department thereof who may come down here and urge us to pass or not to pass certain legislation?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I regret to say it does not. That problem was considered, but the difficulty of meeting it must be quite apparent to the gentleman. The same thing may be said of Members of Congress who might urge other Members to support or defeat certain legislation.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is there anything in this bill to reach the lobbyists who work through the members of a department to influence Members of Congress?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, I do not think any lobbyist could prevail upon a member of a department. We are the only susceptible people!

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Let us make this practical and assume that the Lake Carriers' Association is interested in a bill that has been introduced in Congress. Assume further that a representative of theirs here in Washington is requested by that association to see the Members of Congress in reference to this bill. Does the pending legislation include that individual?

Mr. O'CONNOR. He comes down here, as I understand it, and registers in the Clerk's office; then he files a statement which shows who employs him and how much he receives in pay and what he expends in connection with the mission. There should be no reluctance on the part of the lake carriers, or the individual, to disclose this information.

Mr. DONDERO. This might go far enough to include labor organizations and farmer organizations?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. LAMNECK. Does it include those organizations?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understand it includes any organization that is trying to influence the passage or defeat of legislation.

Mr. LAMNECK. As an illustration may I say that a week or two ago there appeared before our committee Admiral Hobson who is interested in a narcotic drive throughout the United States. He was down here urging us not to do a certain thing in reference to a bill which was then pending before our committee. He is not hired as a lobbyist. He is an employee of this world-wide organization. Would this bill prevent him from coming down here and urging us to pass or not to pass legislation?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman mean that he appeared before a particular committee?

Mr. LAMNECK. Yes; and he contacted many Members of Congress.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As to the proposition of appearing before a committee, he is specifically exempted. I hesitate to

answer some of these questions, because members of the Judiciary Committee and some members of our Rules Committee know much more about the situation than I do, but, as I understand it, if he is here representing an organization and contacting Congressmen he must register and account for his expenses. I do not know why he should object to that.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. This does not prevent anybody from coming down here. All they have to do is to register when they get here; is not that true?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; that is true.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman is the very able chairman of the Rules Committee, and, aside from the matter immediately under discussion, I am wondering if the gentleman would inform the House why the Rules Committee has seen fit to give no consideration to the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], to investigate the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman want to inquire about a number of other measures before the Rules Committee? [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLARD. The gentleman from Ohio asked the gentleman from New York about lobbying by the executive departments or the administrative bureaus. As a matter of fact, on page 7, the bill specifically exempts any public official acting in his official capacity.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct. I had forgotten that for the moment. That was put in there to meet the suggestion as to Congressmen principally.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, who is an able lawyer, whether in his opinion under the terms of this bill representatives of farm organizations, labor organizations, veterans' organizations, flood-control and waterway organizations would come under it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think I have answered that question by saying that in my opinion they would, but I would prefer to have the committee go into that fully. In my opinion they would, and I can see no objection to that.

Mr. SHORT. Do the provisions of this bill forbid any lobbyist from seeing a Member of Congress while we are not in session, for instance, calling upon us at our homes?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not think so, but it should be discouraged. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me on one further point?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. LAMNECK. We are now having a tax bill considered before the Committee on Ways and Means, and I have several hundred letters from prominent business men of my district who want to come here and talk to me about the tax bill. Would they be prevented from coming here and talking to me about it, or would they have to register?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Not at all.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I am entirely in harmony with this proposed antilobbying legislation, but I would like to ask the very able gentleman from New York for his interpretation of the bill in one respect. Would representatives of individual companies who come to Washington on matters that pertain to their business alone be covered by this bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. In my opinion, not.



Mr. LUDLOW. Or would they have to establish a domicile here and engage in general lobby to come within the terms of the measure?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I notice a provision at the top of page 6, subsection (c), of paragraph 7, containing this language:

To influence, directly or indirectly, the election or defeat of any candidate for any elective Federal office.

Under the present Corrupt Practices Act, Members of Congress file reports with the Clerk of the House only with reference to the general election and with the authorities of their own States with respect to primary elections. Would this subsection also require the filing with the Clerk of the House of Representatives of an account of the contributions and expenditures in primary elections?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That matter has been discussed thoroughly here this afternoon, and it was pointed out that, in the opinion of a number of the members of the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee, in the Newberry case, in the Supreme Court of the United States it was held that no Federal law could be passed applying to primaries, and any measure that we might enact must apply only to general elections.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. FULLER. That applies to the candidate himself, but would it not affect such people as the Townsendites, who go out and try to defeat a man who is opposed to their plan, or would it not apply to Father Coughlin, who is in the same line of business, or to the Liberty League? They would have to file a report under that provision, would they not?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11663) to require reports of receipts and disbursements of certain contributions, to require the registration of persons engaged in attempting to influence legislation, to prescribe punishments for violation of this act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11663, with Mr. COLE of Maryland in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can be of any material assistance to the Committee in discussing this bill or not. It shall be my purpose to clarify, if I am able to do so, some of the questions that this bill covers and some things it attempts to do.

The history of this bill is this, as I understand it: We have had a great many lobby and antilobby bills before the Judiciary Committee of the House. I would like to have the membership get this statement, regardless of how they feel about the passage of lobby or antilobby legislation. It is practically impossible to agree upon the terms of an antilobby bill which is broad and comprehensive, and one that will satisfy the various groups and interests of this Nation.

We have had hearings day after day in an effort to work out a bill that was comprehensive enough to cover situations that you and I know ought to be covered, but we run afoul of labor, we run afoul of the veterans' associations, we run afoul of the rural letter carriers, farm organizations, and we run into trouble on every turn.

We also come in conflict with the advocates of free speech, and so forth, and the right to petition guaranteed by the Constitution.

It is very easy to say, "You ought to draft a bill that is comprehensive and has teeth in it", but you undertake to do it and get it through a committee or pass it through this body, and you will find that you are up against it. That was the situation we had confronting us.

This bill came to us from the Rules Committee. I am not a member of the subcommittee that considered the bill. Subcommittees 3 and 4 considered the bill for days; they wrote it and rewrote and wrote it again and again in an effort to arrive at a bill that would really meet the situation.

The bill before us may be divided into two divisions. Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, are simply that part of the bill requiring an accounting of money collected from and by various organizations, and so forth.

It seems to me that is a wholesome provision and should be enacted into law. What is there that should prevent or what argument should be made against any organization that collects money from its membership for the purpose of influencing legislation or other action by the Congress—what reason is there that organizations should not be compelled to file an account of the money collected and expended? That is all that the first six sections do in effect.

Now, I want to call attention particularly to section 6, and let us see to whom the bill applies.

It says:

The provisions of this act shall apply to any individual, partnership, committee (except a political committee as defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act), association, corporation, or any other organization or group of persons who by themselves, or through any agent or employee or other persons in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicit, collect, or receive money or other thing of value to be used in whole or in part to aid, or the principal purpose of which organization is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes:

(a) The enactment or defeat of any legislation or appropriation by the Congress of the United States, or the repeal or nonrepeal of any existing laws of the United States, or the adoption or defeat of any amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(b) To influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation or appropriation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MILLARD. What is the difference between the first portion of subsection (a) and subsection (b)?

Mr. MILLER. Subsection (a) refers to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States and was intended to deal primarily with the repeal or nonrepeal of existing laws. The first two lines of subsection (a) are not different from subsection (b). Subsection (b), of course, is self-explanatory.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. HARLAN. Let us bring this down to a practical proposition. There is not a community here that does not have an organization along the lines of the Knights and Ladies of the Right, or something else.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Mr. HARLAN. That has some idea to change the world overnight.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Mr. HARLAN. They meet in their sewing circles and take up a collection to have some literature printed and sent to the Congress. They do not come here at all. They simply have something printed and sent here.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. HARLAN. Then somebody collects \$25 from their membership and it is used for that purpose. Do they come under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. MILLER. If the principal purpose of the organization is to influence legislation or to amend the Constitution of the United States, they do.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. LAMNECK. I want to know whether this applies to the National Association of Letter Carriers, the National Association of Clerks, the National Association of Rural Carriers, or the National Association of the Brotherhood of



Locomotive Engineers, or to the United Mine Workers, and such organizations as those.

Mr. MILLER. If the organizations collect money and distribute money intended for the purpose directly or indirectly of influencing legislation, they do, of course.

Mr. LAMNECK. The gentleman knows that all those organizations have legislative agents in Washington.

Mr. MILLER. That is true.

Mr. LAMNECK. As a lawyer, does the gentleman say that it would apply to those groups or that it would not?

Mr. MILLER. I say that it would apply to those groups.

Mr. LAMNECK. In other words, if they come down here for a bill to increase salaries or to do something else, they have to register.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. DIES. I call the gentleman's attention again to subsection (c), and I want the gentleman to explain how under the Newberry case, which only applies to the candidate himself in a primary election, we would be precluded under that decision from requiring these associations and groups to report their expenditures, to affect the nomination of a candidate for office.

Mr. MILLER. Simply in this way. The gentleman overlooks his premise. The constitutional provision does not deal with individuals, it does not deal with the individual who is a candidate, but it deals with the election, and the provision of the Constitution which gives the Congress its authority over the election of its Members deals with the election, and not with individuals. That is the distinction.

Mr. DIES. Under the terms of this bill, if there is an indirect effect upon an election, let us say, assuming that a utility company is in the gentleman's district—

Mr. MILLER. Oh, I ask the gentleman not to take up my time. The gentleman is confused about the definition of the word "election." The word "election", as used in the Constitution, refers to that operation by which a candidate is chosen by the people. If the gentleman will look at the case of United States against Gradwell, decided about 15 years prior to the Newberry case, he will find that the court took up the history of primary elections and pointed out the fact that primary elections were never included or thought of when the Constitution was written, and primary elections were not even intended to be included in the Corrupt Practices Act. I am sure the gentleman is a better lawyer than I am, and things that look confusing to me look plain to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Suppose an industry in the district of any Member of this House is informed of legislation that may affect that industry either adversely or favorably. The industry selects a man to come here to Washington to inquire about the legislation and to see the individual Members of Congress. Does this bill go far enough to stop him from coming here?

Mr. MILLER. It would not stop him from coming or from talking, but he ought to register if he did come, or I am afraid that he would run afoul of the law.

Mr. DONDERO. Suppose he comes for that one purpose only and goes back home. Would he be a lobbyist?

Mr. MILLER. I believe that he would have to register under section 7 of the bill.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mrs. KAHN. Take an organization such as the League of Women Voters, where the service is practically voluntary. They certainly take a great interest in bills being passed by the Congress. Would they come under this?

Mr. MILLER. If they collect money for that purpose or expend it, I think they would.

Mrs. KAHN. If they did not collect it directly, but if they were financed by the dues of the organization, would they come under this bill?

Mr. MILLER. Of course, it would depend upon whether or not they were principally organized for the purpose of influencing legislation.

Mrs. KAHN. Of course they are principally organized to consider the principles of good government.

Mr. MILLER. If they were, they would probably have to file a statement of their receipts and expenditures.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. This is a very serious question. Representing the textile industry, if certain officials paid by textile manufacturers, sent a dozen men to Washington and they all spoke before a committee but afterward saw me personally, each of the dozen men must register as lobbyists, get a receipt for his railroad fare, for his hotel bill, keep those receipts 2 years and go through all that formality?

Mr. MILLER. No, no. They would not have to go through all that formality of keeping their receipts and so forth, because they would not be collecting any money from any organizations, the primary purpose of which was to influence legislation, but they would have to register when they came here as lobbyists.

Mr. GIFFORD. If they spoke to a committee alone, would they have to register?

Mr. MILLER. No, no.

Mr. GIFFORD. But if they happened to come to my office, a dozen of them, they would have to register?

Mr. MILLER. The purpose of this bill—

Mr. GIFFORD. Never mind the purpose. We understand the purpose is to terrorize these people.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no. In all seriousness—

Mr. GIFFORD. Now, be serious. If they spoke to me personally, they would have to register?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know anybody who wants to terrorize anybody.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, that is the intent of this.

Mr. MILLER. No. This is not the intent of this bill. I would not want to terrorize anybody and I am very much in favor of this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to pursue my inquiry a step further. Suppose a representative who comes here for an industry happens to be their attorney through the year, or even an officer of that industry himself; does the gentleman then say he would come within the provisions of this bill, where his visit is incident to his regular work?

Mr. MILLER. He might not come under section 7, but I am going to offer an amendment to bring him under it. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLANE. I already have one prepared.

Mr. MILLER. Further discussing the question raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts, that is a pertinent question, and I want to call attention to section 7 of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] has again expired.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I also yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to section 7. I do not want to do anything to prevent any constituent of anybody or any interest in the United States from presenting his or their case to the American Congress. Everybody has a perfect right, whether that right be guaranteed under the Constitution or otherwise—they just simply have that natural right to speak for themselves. Congress or any other lawmaking body is always glad to hear from the real parties in interest in proposed legislation. It is not the purpose of section 7 to curb that right or to prevent that right from being exercised at all. Now, what does section 7 do? It does not matter what my personal views are about it or what your personal views are about it. We



are up against not so much a theory as against a condition that exists here. It is said there are lobbyists running wild in Washington. I do not know whether I ever saw one or not. I heard a great deal of talk about lobbyists all during this utility legislation, and I became convinced of one thing, and that was that I did not amount to anything, because no lobbyists ever spoke to me, as far as I know, and I think probably the situation is altogether overdrawn.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I simply wanted at this point to say that I do not know that I have been approached by any lobbyist, to know him, but you now want to tag all my friends as lobbyists who come here from my State. You want to tag them as such, and I object.

Mr. MILLER. No. The gentleman's friends are not all lobbyists; they are good citizens. [Applause and laughter.] They are good citizens and mean well.

Mr. GIFFORD. But I want to say to the gentleman that if these friends of mine identified with business, come down here and take expense money, they have to go over and register and then everybody says, "Lobbyist! Lobbyist"! It is a terrorizing word, really.

Mr. MILLER. Under section 7—and I want to call attention to it—any person who shall accept employment for any consideration—now for what purpose? If he accepts employment for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any pending or proposed legislation or appropriation.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Would an attorney be within the terms of the bill who is primarily engaged to represent a corporation and comes to Washington only occasionally during the sessions of Congress to lobby?

Mr. MILLER. It is doubtful, as pointed out by the gentleman from New Jersey, that such a person would come under it. I say he should come under it.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE] and myself, have prepared an amendment strengthening this provision which will be presented in due time. Is not the gentleman from Arkansas in favor of strengthening this provision so as to get the attorneys of these corporations?

Mr. MILLER. I thought I had made myself perfectly clear on that; I am. If these gentlemen from Texas can work out an amendment of this kind, so far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly satisfied to have them do it.

What else have we? Whether it is true or not, the people of this Nation think a great deal of legislation is effected by lobbying; that the judgment of the Congress is warped or directed by sinister influences; and they always speak about "the interests", and about this influence and that influence affecting Congress. I think we owe it to the people to pass this legislation, and I do not see why any honest person who has legitimate business to present before a body of the Congress, a committee or otherwise, would have the slightest objection to registering as provided by the terms of section 7.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again? I hate to trespass so much on the gentleman's time.

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman explain why he omitted from the bill these lobbyists who appear before bureaus and agencies with regard to having Government contracts canceled or altered in favor of their employers?

Mr. MILLER. This gentleman did not omit anything from the bill. This bill came from the Rules Committee, as I said, to the Judiciary Committee, and subcommittees 3 and 4 worked on the matter.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Quite a number of the departments require attorneys and others practicing before the department to register and obtain a license, as the gentleman knows. Included in these are the Patent Office, Treasury Department, and a dozen others. They have what might be called bars of their own.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman does not mean that all of them require registration?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. There are 10 or a dozen which do.

Mr. DIES. What is that to the hundreds there are?

Mr. MILLER. I would like to proceed for just a little while, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I want now to call attention to one condition which, in my opinion, justifies the enactment of this bill; that is the publication of articles by lobbyists or others in an effort to create public sentiment for or against legislation. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], at the time the gentleman from New Jersey was speaking, called attention to certain propaganda that swept this country with reference to a certain bill recently before the Committee on the Judiciary.

The greatest harm done in this country today, the greatest disservice that is done your constituents and my constituents, is done by organizations that do not give them the facts of a situation as it exists, but through the publication of syndicated articles in various magazines and periodicals build up and control public sentiment without disclosing to the people their selfish interest in the subject matter. It is perfectly natural for a person to believe what he reads.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me once more?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I presume the purpose of this bill is to protect Congressmen. Would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment providing that when the lobbyist registers he should be handed a blue ribbon in order that he may be plainly marked so we shall know him?

Mr. MILLER. I would if the badges were made of different colors, for we must have something to keep them separated. I do not, however, think at all it is for the purpose of protecting Congressmen.

Mr. GIFFORD. It is a stigma on them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What language does the bill contain which will make available to the public and the press the registry and the information to be filed by the lobbyists? The public is as much interested in this as are the Members of Congress.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman asks if it will be made available to the public?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the information, for instance, be subject to review by newspapermen so they can place it before the public?

Mr. MILLER. It will be a public record; yes. It will be such a record that will disclose the selfish interest that has prompted the publication of the article and in that manner the people will not be misled. The people can be trusted fully if they have the facts before them, but they never get the true facts by reading the statements and newspapers that are printed by the paid lobbyists and who are serving the interests of their employers.

The bill is a step in the right direction and should be passed. It will help us all serve the people who have no paid lobbyist here.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am in somewhat the same position as the gentleman from Arkansas in that I



have never had any lobbyists trouble me particularly. I have always thought that the Members of Congress were men of such conviction that what lobbyists might say to them would not have any particular effect. Of course, we have different types of lobbyists.

Since my return to Congress a year or so ago I found the most iniquitous type was the Government lobbyist, who comes up here and tries to bring pressure upon Members to legislate in a certain way. I do not know whether there is anything in this bill that will compel those men to register so that we may know just what kind of work they are carrying on.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLARD. The bill specifically exempts them. The chairman of the Rules Committee so stated.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I think there should be an amendment to the bill so that we may know who the men are that are clogging up these halls and preventing us from getting into the Chamber. We should find out whether those men belong to the executive department of the Government or to the other iniquitous class of lobbyist. Possibly this bill will accomplish a great deal of good. I expect to vote for it, and I hope it will function according to the intent that its sponsors claim for it.

Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether the bill takes in small groups of men and women throughout the country who may get together and present their views to Members of Congress, either in person or by way of petition with reference to legislation in which they might be interested. Some have said the bill does not cover that. This morning I received a communication from a group of 50 individuals in Minnesota who got together and collected enough money to have their communication written by a stenographer and attach the necessary postage thereto.

These individuals are the residents of a Federal homestead project which is being sponsored by the administration. It appears that this group of men and women has written to the officials of the Government to get information in connection with their particular troubles, and not being able to get any information whatsoever, they saw fit to write to me and to other Members of Congress, as well as Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, wife of the Chief Executive of this Nation. I want to read this communication and inquire whether or not this group comes under the provisions of the bill, and whether it would be necessary for them, under the provisions of the bill, to register. They write me as follows:

DEAR SIR: Word has been received from Washington that the administration desires to know how this homestead project is being received by the homesteaders and what impression it is making upon the citizens of the surrounding territory.

We, the homesteaders, welcome this opportunity to make a direct contact with the administration.

We were chosen as dependable people with salaries, people who would take pride in keeping and improving a home, and we were given to understand that we would be buying homes of small cost at a low rate of interest on the unpaid balance.

When we signed our temporary licensing agreement we were promised that our permanent contracts for title would be in our hands by March 1936. With this understanding we moved in. We put our own money and labor into improving the places, making them habitable, and planning homes in which we would have quiet, peace, and security.

The following questions have been asked of Government officials, but they have not given satisfactory answers.

Will the cost of the repairs, which are now being made and which we are told are necessary due to the fact that the houses were improperly built, be added to the final purchase price in addition to what the houses originally cost? Such repairs as insulating the bathtubs, weather-stripping windows, repairing roof boards which were improperly installed and now necessitate removing a strip around the entire roof, adding cold-air ducts to the heating system, installing water pans in furnaces, repairing leaks in roofs, resealing the basement headings, repairing basement floors, etc.

Why, if we are merely lessees or renters, as our present contract states, must we maintain our own repairs on homes that do not belong to us? Why must we pay taxes, maintain our own roads? How can we afford to paint, varnish, build cupboards, plant annual shrubs, other than the ones which we are told that we are going to receive, when we have only a 30-day assurance that we have our homes to live in?

When mechanical features were placed in these homes no directions were given as to the proper method of oiling, cleaning, and their general care; nor was general advice given for their proper usage. Why then must we, as renters, be held responsible for their operation and repairs?

Why must we be forced to build a \$10,000 community house, equipped with conveniences which we do not need, necessitating a continuous fire throughout 8 months of the year, and a custodian to do away with the ever-present menace of vandalism, when a meeting house is all that we would need? This could be built for about \$2,500. We hear it rumored that \$5,000 already has been allotted and is included in our monthly payments. If that is so, the difference could be returned to us for more needful purposes.

Who is to pay the salaries of the officials who have been sent here from time to time for the purpose of investigation and supervision? Why must we be sent new supervisors at short intervals who have no personal interest in our welfare, and who have proven incompetent, dictatorial, and ungentlemanly, stirring up a feeling of uncertainty and discontent, and disrupting the neighborly spirit of our community?

Why, when we have caused an organization of our own to be formed for the betterment of our entire group socially and for a more convenient form of dealing with representatives of the Government, must an official who is sent to us with the purpose of cementing friendship, start breeding seeds of discontent by appointing committees of outside people over the heads of our group and cause a general disturbance in our organization?

Why are we now to be put upon a 5-year proving period before we receive a contract for deed; this 5 years was not in the original agreement. We were told by the first committee that the term of payment would be 20 years; later Mr. Plum informed us that the term of payment would be 30 years, and upon this we understand our payments are based. Now, Mr. Stephenson informs us that the term has been changed to 40 years. When will our payments per month be lowered in conformity with this change. We are told that during these 40 years we will not be allowed to pay up our contract other than paying the greater share of it for the purpose of lowering our interest rate. In the event of our death, would our equity in these homes be passed on to our heirs?

We entered into the idea of a good little home on a small acreage where we could be happy, and now we are told that we are merely living in these homes from month to month, with the ever-present menace of being forced out by each new supervisor whose ideas may conflict with those of his predecessor. These conditions rather than being conducive to happiness, cause such a state of mental uncertainty that it is impossible to live a normal life.

Why has not the final contract for title been presented this month as was originally promised, so that we could become legitimate taxpayers and not taxed renters? When do we receive a final contract? When will we be able to use and improve the property in our own way without the necessity of having an overseer in charge?

Copies to Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Hon. Henrik Shipstead, Hon. Elmer Benson, Hon. Rexford Tugwell, Mr. B. G. Stephenson, Miss Corrine Jahren.

Mr. Chairman, this communication is signed by all of the men and women who reside on this particular Government subsistence homestead project which is located in my congressional district.

Mr. CREAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. May I ask the gentleman if there is a Republican precinct committee man on that list?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I am frank to say I do not know any of them, but these are men and women who had faith in the good intentions of the Government. They were willing to go ahead and spend their own money in order to obtain a home. Apparently the Government is now saddling upon them so many burdens that instead of getting a moderate-priced home they will be forced to pay for more than 40 years, or for a generation or two, in order to get a home for themselves and their families.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. I assume the gentleman knows that the particular activity to which he has just referred is under the charge of Prof. Rex Tugwell. Does the gentleman know further that Mr. Tugwell at present is boondoggling with some \$290,000,000, but his tenure of office is uncertain, because Field Marshal Farley is demanding his resignation? However, some other influence is keeping him in. That may be the reason for the fact these good people cannot get a reply.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his comment. I have not had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Tugwell.



Mr. CULKIN. He is a very charming gentleman, a great personality.

Mr. ANDRESEN. But I feel these people, who have entered into contracts with the Government, as citizens of this country, have a right to receive courteous treatment. They are entitled to a fulfillment of the contracts which they entered into. The Government should carry out the specifications of the contracts in reference to the building of those homes without extra cost to the people. These individuals are entitled to an answer. They are entitled to an "honest deal" at the hands of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether these good people up there could be called lobbyists or not. I do not feel that they are lobbyists. I feel they have a right to get together, just as they have done in this instance, and file their petition, asking their Representative in Congress, whether it be myself or someone else, to intercede for them with the officials in Washington who have absolute and unlimited power and money.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Would you consider that they are lobbyists if they selected some person to come down here with photographs and present the matter to the Congress, and would they have to register as lobbyists?

Mr. THOM. Their Congressman ought to do it for them.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Their Congressman will take care of it, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to serve them in this or any other capacity.

Mr. THOM. He does not seem to have done it.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I do not think they would be considered as lobbyists, although there might be some gentlemen on this side of the aisle who would brand them as such.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. THOM. Has the gentleman submitted those questions and complaints to the proper department here before publishing them in this way?

Mr. ANDRESEN. The letter of complaint which I have just read reached me today and I have transmitted it to Dr. Tugwell by mail.

Mr. THOM. No; the gentleman has not done a thing yet in behalf of his constituents.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Because these people submitted these questions to the Department time after time and got no satisfaction. Therefore they were forced to communicate with their Member of Congress in order to bring the matter to the attention of the high and distinguished gentleman in the executive Department, and I am now calling it to your attention and to the attention of the other Members of the Congress.

Mr. THOM. But as yet the gentleman has not presented the complaints to Mr. Tugwell or to any official authorized to deal with the matter.

Mr. ANDRESEN. They are in the mail and now on the way.

Mr. THOM. Oh, I see.

Mr. ANDRESEN. And this is a very opportune time to let you gentlemen know what is being done by men high up in the administrative departments here in the Nation's Capital. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I have carefully read this bill and attempted to digest it. I realize the bill is going to pass, because the Members of Congress think they are under suspicion and have not nerve enough to try to amend the bill or try to defeat it. In the language of my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas, "we owe it to our people back home to pass this bill." We do not owe them anything of the kind. We do not owe them any right to acknowledge

that there is a lobby here that is influencing Members of Congress, because it is not a fact.

I think I can truthfully say, without fear of successful contradiction, that during the time I have served here of four terms I never even heard a man in this House suspected of having solicited or accepting anything or having been improperly influenced in voting for any measure on the floor of this House. You cannot force honesty into people by law any more than you can religion.

The purposes of this bill are commendable, but it is just like fishing for a minnow and getting hold of an alligator. They go out and take in the entire universe. They drag in honest men when they are trying to get crooks, and they do not even seek to catch a crook. Why, a crook who is a real crook, and would come here for the purpose of lobbying and buying and influencing a Member of Congress, would not come here and register, would he? Certainly not; and whom would you get? You would get the legitimate people of my district, your district, and the legitimate people all over the United States. Whom else would you catch? The railroad employees, who, more or less, maintain an organization here to look after their interests. All the union labor and veteran organizations which come here not only to appear before the committees but to contact their Congressman from their district, and also to send out literature and propaganda. You would get each and every one of them as lobbyists and require them to register. You would also catch the civil-service employees, the mail carriers and the rural carriers and the clerks and all the Federal employees here in Washington, who keep a bureau here continuously and are sending propaganda to us almost daily, both personally and in the newspapers, thus seeking to influence legislation. They would be designated as lobbyists.

Not only this, but under the terms of the bill every farm organization in the country is a lobbying organization, and the heads of these organizations would have to register when they came to Washington. They come not only for the purpose of appearing before committees but they want to talk to their Congressman. I want them to talk to me. I am not afraid of being contaminated by people of this character who come here to talk and lay their cards on the table. They would have to register under the terms of this bill and be branded as lobbyists.

If a constituency has a Representative in Congress that it suspicions, the way to remedy that situation is to remedy it at home and keep him there, and not send him to a Congress that has to pass a law to rule and regulate him and keep lobbyists from coming in contact with him.

It would catch men coming here today in connection with public improvements. Men who are here in the interests of W. P. A. and P. W. A. and their attorneys and engineers. They are coming here for the purpose of influencing public officials in connection with appropriations for courthouses, schoolhouses, roads, libraries, universities, and especially when it comes to a matter of post-office appropriations that we are going to have to pass upon. You would get them all.

Mr. LAMNECK. Also Governors and mayors.

Mr. FULLER. Certainly; none of them are exempt.

Why, some good women came here from my State the other day to talk to the Arkansas delegation, including myself. They were sent by the tuberculosis association of my State with the purpose in mind of having a law enacted to carry out the objects of their association. Only a few days ago various officers of my State were here in the interest of the Arkansas Centennial, seeking an appropriation. Under this law they must register, give an account of money received and expended, and thus be branded as lobbyists. Such legislation is childish.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FULLER. Why, Mr. Chairman, if any of these good women came here on birth control they would have to register as lobbyists. [Laughter.]

If they have to register, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said, what is the use of having a register, if you



cannot identify them? If conditions are as bad all over the country as they say they are in Texas, they ought to have a badge on them that states, "I am registered as a lobbyist", and it ought to be in red as a sign of danger, so that we who are presumed to be the suckers may know when we come in contact with them.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is the gentleman worried about birth control? [Laughter.]

Mr. FULLER. Not a bit in the world. I recollect when the gentleman from Texas appeared on the floor of the House and made a wonderful speech in which he paid a tribute to his State and got an appropriation for \$3,000,000 for a celebration. Today the gentleman said in substance the legislators in his State were so dishonest they had to pass a bill requiring the lobbyist to register, and when they came to register it was discovered the register was stolen. [Laughter.] My people are not that kind. Few of that kind of people are coming here asking for legislation. They would have no influence if they did.

The Rules Committee was designated as a committee to investigate lobbyists as a result of the utility legislation. This bill is the result of that investigation. It is a demonstration that the mountains have been in labor and brought forth a mouse. If a representative from any person or corporation, even as attorney or agent, comes to Washington with his expenses paid for the purpose of influencing an appropriation or influencing the action of any Congressman, he must register and therefore is branded as a lobbyist. The good citizen, of course, would register, but the crook would never register; and, in fact, would find another way of doing business if he were engaged in corrupt practices. The whole purpose of this bill is to protect Congress from sinister influences. To me it is a demagogue bill which seeks to appease the public, but it is a bill that has no teeth in it, goes nowhere, does nothing, and accomplishes nothing except to humiliate the good citizens of our States who come here on legitimate business. Suppose a lobbyist were to register, how would Members of Congress know him or know that he had registered? In my opinion a law should be enacted to make it a penitentiary offense to in any way be interested in influencing improperly or with dishonest or sinister motives a Member of Congress. In fact, that is practically the law now. If any other measure could be suggested to make it stronger, it would certainly meet with my approval; but to me this bill is nothing more than an insult to the Members of Congress, an acknowledgment that we are possibly being influenced, and in order to protect ourselves we are willing to have our friends who come here register as lobbyists.

This bill should never become a law in its present form.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I am sorry that the gentleman from Arkansas who just preceded me was not with us when we worked so many days and weeks over the language of the bill, that he did not have an opportunity with other Members to study and realize the purposes of the bill and the reasons behind it. If he had, I am sure that the eloquent speech that he has made would have been for the bill instead of against it.

We all know that there is no purpose of terrorizing anyone or branding anyone. I think in giving an explanation of the purposes of the bill I would begin by perhaps telling you what the bill does not do rather than what the bill does do.

There is no legislation on this subject at this time. As you all know, there have been efforts from time to time to secure legislation on this subject. Nobody could hope to get a perfect bill, perfect legislation on the subject in the first bill that is enacted. It is going to be a process of evolution, and we have sought to bring in a bill here for your consideration which would in a measure correct the evils without running into many complications.

I want to tell you a few things that the bill does not cover, and that perhaps will answer some of the questions that have been asked here today.

In the first place, it does not prohibit anyone from doing anything. The bill does not stop or preclude any activity that is going on now. The only thing it does in that particular is to make them come forward and disclose whom they represent, who pays them, and the amount they are paid. It seems to me that no person can object to that—no one but a dishonest person, and it is the dishonest persons we are after in this bill.

I would say there are three classes of people affected by this bill, commonly known as lobbyists. One class will be those people who sit at home and raise great funds to flood Congress with false propaganda; people who cause telegrams and letters to be sent to you and to me to try to make it appear to us that there is a great surge of public sentiment for or against a certain measure proposed here.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DOBBINS. I do not believe that the bill as drawn covers those people. It refers to any one employed by certain organizations. Take an organization like Magills. That is not employed by anyone. It receives contributions from people.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think I can answer that. I think it does reach that class. That is perhaps the most harmful class, in my estimation, because they seek to make us believe that the sentiment at home for or against legislation is not what it really is; and the Magill case and the case of Hopson in the matter of the utilities bill last year are strong illustrations of that situation, where millions of fictitious letters and telegrams were sent to Members of Congress.

There is another class of lobbyists, and he is the man who gets employed under the false pretense that he has a great influence with Members of Congress. He comes here and probably registers at some hotel and may perhaps sit in the gallery for a few days, write some letters back home, and learn to speak to a few Members of Congress, but he never does a single thing toward influencing legislation, good or bad. Yet he poses as performing a great service for his people. That class of people will object to registering.

The third class of people are those who come here regularly employed, honestly employed by honest organizations, honest trade and other associations. They have a legitimate purpose here. They disclose that purpose frankly and openly; and at times they give to Members of Congress, I have no doubt, as they have given to me, valuable information. They come here openly. These people will be required to register; and my view of the subject is that when we compel them to register and disclose who they are, the honest, legitimate employee who comes here to represent his people will be placed on a higher plane and will not be placed in the class with those folk who come here under false pretenses.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. This week I have had in Washington two members of the board of directors of a corporation in Pontiac, Mich., who came here to confer with me about the proposed tax bill as it will affect their company. Does the gentleman think those men should be registered as lobbyists and subjected to that embarrassment?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If they have come here and are paid for coming here, they are required to register. If they are here for an honest purpose, they ought not to object to registering, and if they are here for a dishonest purpose, we ought to know it.

Mr. DONDERO. But they have come as representatives of their own property, of their own company, to confer with their Congressman regarding taxes to be imposed upon them. Does the gentleman think they should be required to register under those circumstances?



Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I commend the gentleman for his efforts to eliminate, or to try and bring about control of a bad evil, but I want to ask if the gentleman does not think the language of the bill, especially section 6, goes a little bit too far. For instance, you are going to require the filing with the clerk of the membership of great organizations whose representatives are here and who have been here for years and years. They are all interested not only in legislation but in other matters. Does the gentleman not think that that should be amended to some extent?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The bill as it is drafted would perhaps require a tremendous organization like a labor organization that has millions of members who contribute, under some construction, to report to Congress all dues that they receive, but in order to meet that situation I should be very glad, when we reach the 5-minute rule, to offer an amendment which would cut that out and make it all right.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that, as the statement is in keeping with the gentleman's view as expressed to me privately a short while ago. The gentleman's attitude clearly shows his desire to be perfectly fair. I am sure all Members appreciate the very difficult task of the gentleman from Virginia, and I am confident in view of the gentleman's attitude, when this bill is finally sent to the White House many Members now opposed to its provisions will be found supporting and commending our good friend from Virginia.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. I am in sympathy with the spirit and purpose of the gentleman's bill, and I intend to vote for it, but I want an interpretation from the gentleman himself. Suppose a businessman or an attorney employed by that businessman should come to Washington to take up with Members of Congress a matter affecting that businessman's business. Would he have to be registered as a lobbyist?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not think so.

Mr. LUDLOW. Or would his attorney have to register as a lobbyist?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If his attorney is here for the purpose of endeavoring to influence legislation, he would have to register.

Mr. LUDLOW. Representing only that one company?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. If he is here to influence legislation. Undoubtedly there will be some cases where registration may be required where it ought not to be required, but you cannot frame this language for every case, because so many people come here for so many different purposes. Doubtless there will be some hardships under any language you may adopt, but I think the good of the bill will far outweigh the hardships.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman has stated that perhaps organizations, such as the American Federation of Labor, might be affected by this legislation. I would like to ask the gentleman if this provision in section 7, requiring the person or organization to state the names of papers, periodicals, and magazines to which they have contributed articles, would also affect organizations maintaining newspapers, such as the American Federation of Labor and other organizations that do maintain periodicals?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In the original draft of the bill there was a provision that required publications which were published for the particular purpose of influencing legislation to come under the terms of the bill. After consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary it was concluded that was going too far and struck out that provision with respect to publications. The only reference to publications is the one that is now in the bill.

Mr. HEALEY. What situation does the provision apply to now?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If they take a page advertisement in all the Washington newspapers, for instance, saying we are going to ruin the pickle industry. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FORD of California. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia the status of an attorney who lives here in Washington, has an office in Washington, who represents some interest, mining, coal, or whatnot.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But what is he doing? Is he attempting to influence legislation?

Mr. FORD of California. In that capacity, if he undertakes to influence the activities of Members of Congress, will he then come within the purview of this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think so, if he is employed for that purpose.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman said he intended to introduce an amendment to exempt labor organizations?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not specifically, but to cover a case of that kind, where their activities here are merely incidental, where it is not the principal purpose of the organization to influence legislation.

Mr. CULKIN. Of course, that general amendment would cover farm organizations, such as the Grange?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Anything that falls within that classification. However, their representatives here, who are paid and employed here for the purpose of influencing legislation, would have to register just like anybody else.

Mr. CULKIN. It would be difficult to carry out the provisions of section 3 without some such exemption.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I realize that.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FULLER. As I understand the real intent and purpose of this bill, it is to protect the Congress from sinister influences?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at all. I do not think Congress needs any protection. I think we can protect ourselves.

Mr. FULLER. What could be the purpose of this? If a man registers, we would not know that he has registered.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, sir. You would not know he had registered unless you took the trouble to walk into the Clerk's office to find out; but it would be there just the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is not strange that a jittery administration should try to do something to prevent opposition to a lot of New Deal legislation such as we have had. A few moments ago I stated they wanted to do something to "terrorize" the business of the country. That is, this entrenched greed they talk about should now be curbed. They should not be allowed any longer to "gang up" against this administration. They wish now to put them on record and know exactly who they may be that oppose them in the future. Heretofore I have boasted that lobbyists did not bother with me. I did not know who they were. But now, in the future, when my friends come here representing my business interests I must first ask them, "Are you registered and stigmatized as a lobbyist?" That word "lobbyist" certainly carries a stigma with it. I read that in this country today people are being taught to believe that there are at least 7,000 Du Ponts, each of them contributing \$12,000,000 to beat the present administration.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not have much time, but I will yield briefly.

Mr. HOOK. Should the word "lobbyist" carry any stigma with it?

Mr. GIFFORD. It should not, perhaps, but it does. All I ask is that when you make those who represent my people



and who come to Washington register, that you give them a blue ribbon. Please give them a blue ribbon, reading "Lobbyist", and then when the contact men of the President or other public officials come here to lobby, put a red ribbon on them, so I can tell them apart. Think of the power of the patronage of this administration and with billions to spend! Their lobbyists are to be excused, but the poor little business organization coming down here must tag his man. This discrimination is utterly ridiculous.

A chamber of commerce often takes the initiative. It collects money from the various businesses involved when there is a bill affecting them pending here. If it collects money they will now have to report it. Then they select a certain number of men to come down here, pay their expenses, and often they pay them for the time which they lose, so they receive remuneration. They may come here and appear before a committee. That is excusable. But if they should happen to see a Congressman and tell him about their errand, I for one would have to first ask, "Have you registered?" I do not want to be pulled into court as a witness against a constituent who may have failed to register, perhaps from ignorance, and who possibly may be made to pay a fine of \$1,000 and perhaps put in jail. I shall have to remember to ask, "Are you registered? I do not dare talk with you unless you are—even if you are here but for 1 day on this particular legislation."

When he goes to a hotel he should register as a lobbyist, and the proprietor should notify us as follows: "There is a lobbyist in the hotel, Congressman. Beware of him. You may become involved."

We should have a private detective to go around with us lest we speak to anybody for fear they may be a lobbyist! I can talk freely; I am not under the influence of any lobbyist. I owe nothing to them, I am perfectly free. Some of you may have had a dinner with one of them recently. But, however, in the future as they will have to report how they spend their money and perhaps you have attended such a dinner, your name may appear in his report.

The bait in the bill is that these fellows must register and tell all about it if their activities are used to defeat or elect us, because this is in it we are supposed to vote for it. Mr. Chairman, I do not even know that I would dare vote against this bill. I am afraid the gentleman who may oppose me, whoever he may be, might attempt to make political capital of it. However, this bill, of course, is aimed against the Townsend plan, and as I am against that plan I would be supposed to vote for it.

I have often taken the floor here and now I suffer what I may call "the weariness of futility" in trying to point out weaknesses in some of the things connected with this administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, many of these things ought to be ridiculed and I am proud of the gentleman from Arkansas who does not fear to do so. Many times he has had the courage to stand here and oppose foolish measures and he does not always excuse this socialistic administration which frames legislation through the help of the Frankfurter boys who have their standing of public officials and would not have to register as lobbyists.

We all agree, of course, that lobbying in regard to the public-utility bill was undoubtedly carried too far. We are glad to have it corrected; but the method you use to correct abuses is generally to abolish or make the innocent suffer more than the guilty.

There is a stigma attached to the word "lobbyist"; you know it; that is why you want to do this. You wish to stigmatize many good citizens. Think of my chamber of commerce back home reporting every 3 months as to everybody who contributed to send labor leaders or other representatives to Washington to tell you the effect of this bill or that bill should they be passed. A person may, of course, appear before a committee, but in what a position we are placed if he comes to see us! Think of the annoyances! He must

get a receipt from the railroad; it says so in the bill if his fare is for more than \$10. He must get a receipt from the hotel if his bill is for \$10, and he must hold them 2 long years and must report every 3 months how he spent the money for his expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Gladly.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am just wondering if the gentleman has read the bill he is discussing.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes, carefully; and I can read a bill; I have had a lot of experience. [Laughter.] I have read it very carefully. I have it here, marked in almost every paragraph. The gentleman's definitions I find no fault with. As I say, section (c), whereby the fellow who tries to defeat us will have to tell all about it, is there as bait. I think the gentleman suggested an amendment with reference to chambers of commerce, labor organizations, and other organizations. I think an amendment may be necessary as they probably ought not to be included; but as I read the bill in its present form a chamber of commerce which solicits money to send people here to defeat or pass a bill certainly would come under it. The gentleman says, "If people are honest they will not object to registering." I would remind the gentleman that the honest man is not the man who desires to come here and register and be known as a lobbyist. The honest man would hesitate lest he fail to live up to all these regulations and be punished. The honest man does not like to take the chance of going to jail, but the dishonest man is used to taking chances and would not so much care.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, if I have time remaining.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. What objection could an honest man have to registering and letting it be known that he is in Washington?

Mr. GIFFORD. An honest man hesitates to take such chances, and the present stigma as a lobbyist does not appeal to him.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. FULLER. What is the object of having a man register? If he has a sinister purpose in his mind, the mere fact of registering will not disclose it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Probably not.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE].

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I also yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

#### WE NEED ADEQUATE ANTILOBBYING LEGISLATION

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who preceded me has raised some interesting questions as to the necessity for this legislation. It is not meant by the proponents of this legislation that those who come to Washington to influence legislation are crooks or are dishonest. That is not the point at all. Might it not be possible that the author of this legislation and those who believe in it have some honest and sincere purposes in mind in offering the legislation?

#### MANY STATES HAVE ANTILOBBY LAWS

Let me call attention to some of these motives. Everything done here is not done, I take it, with an ulterior motive in mind. This is not new legislation to the Congress of the United States or to the legislatures of the various States of the Union. I have taken the time to study carefully the different antilobby laws of the various States of the Union. Some of you may be surprised to know that a majority of the States of this Nation have in effect some kind of antilobby legislation today. It is true that much of the legislation on this subject in the different States is very inadequate to cope with the situation, but the fact that they are trying to deal with the subject shows that the legislators of the various States have recognized the importance of requiring information from these lobbyists for their



membership, and that is very necessary in our complicated system of government. The thing we must be very careful of is to see to it that all parties trying to influence legislation must be required to register and give complete information showing their whole interest.

The Members of Congress are all elected every 2 years and one-third of the Members of the Senate each 2 years. A great many of these Members have had little, if any, previous training or experience in the methods of legislation, and the many different ways these shrewd lobbyists carry on. They come down here unfamiliar with the procedure. The Congress is entitled to know all about their background. These new Members have to learn it all. Under these circumstances it is easy for the lobbyists to deceive an unsuspecting Member however honest and sincere his motives may be.

#### HONEST WILL NOT MIND—OTHERS DO NOT MATTER

Mr. Chairman, is there anything wrong in requiring an honest man to register and give information with reference to the nature of his employment, how much he is receiving, who is paying him, and what legislation he is interested in? No honest man will object to that and certainly the crooks ought to be required to give this information. Why should not Members of Congress know all the motives back of what may be prompting the opposition or the support of any particular legislation? Every Member of Congress is entitled to know the driving motive back of what is prompting an individual or a group to take a certain action. He is entitled to know how much the lobbyist is being paid and who is paying him. The Congress should know the whole background of everyone appearing here for or against legislation. We are entitled to know the size of their fee, whether or not it is contingent, and all such information should be always available to the public. This will give us some idea of what is back of the legislation presented, and perhaps help point out some of the jokers that may be written into such legislation. Legislation is rather speedily presented here. Much of the legislation presented is under gag rules, permitting limited debate, and rushed through under pressure that does not permit mature consideration.

When you know who is supporting a given bill, how much money is being spent to put it over, this gives you notice that you should carefully investigate it and see if it will be for the benefit of the classes or the masses. Most of the legislation enacted prior to this administration for many years has been legislation for the benefit of the special interests.

Why should not the Members of Congress have complete information on these lobbyists? The answer is, They should have it. The answer has been given by a majority of the State legislatures of this Nation which have enacted legislation on this subject. This legislation does not question the motives of the Members of Congress. It simply tries to give to the Members of Congress as much information as it is possible to give, so that the Members may act intelligently upon the legislation which is presented to them for consideration. I submit that we should get all the information that we can on any pending legislation, and when we know the complete background of the different groups for or against a measure it will help us to better arrive at a fair decision for all parties concerned.

#### TEXAS LEGISLATURE FAILED TO ACT

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that we have not adequate antilobby legislation in the State of Texas to take care of the situation there.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

#### DOES NOT APPLY TO PRIMARY ELECTIONS

Mr. DIES. There is one thing that disturbs me about the bill, and that is the fact it does not apply to nominations. Take the case of the gentleman who is now speaking. It is well known that the utilities are fighting the gentleman in his district. However, this legislation will not make it necessary for them to disclose how much money is being spent to try to defeat the gentleman in his own district.

Mr. McFARLANE. The gentleman is right. But I do not believe the people of my district will be misled by the tactics pursued by this crowd not only in my district but throughout the country. It is unfortunate that in the South, where we are elected in the primary, the special interests, such as the public utilities and the other special interest groups that largely control elections, cannot be required to divulge this information and show how much money they have put into these political campaigns toward the election of Congressmen. It seems that there should be some way of requiring this crowd to furnish this information. There is no doubt but what the special interests have elected men to high offices. Under our primary system election in the primary is equivalent to election in the general election, because very seldom do we have any opposition in the general election in the Southern States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it not within the power of the State of Texas to obtain this information?

#### NO RATE REGULATORY COMMISSION IN TEXAS

Mr. McFARLANE. Why, we do not even have a State regulatory utilities commission down there, and the special interests control such legislation in Texas, and they have done so for years. They have blocked such legislation in Texas. Try to get legislation enacted down there to require these paid lobbyists to register and disclose their background—they just have not been able to do it, that is all.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman will recall that an effort was made to bring about certain disclosures with reference to enormous sums of money that had been spent in the State of Texas, and the Supreme Court held that the act could not be enforced because, under our Constitution, it was not a requisite for holding office.

#### SUPREME COURT DECLARES VOID CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

Mr. McFARLANE. They have so held. The law that we had, weak as it was, required certain disclosures to be made in primary elections regarding the campaign contributions received and to limit the amount of money a candidate could spend, but the Supreme Court of Texas in October 1934, as I understand it, practically nullified the accountability in primary elections and held that a corrupt practice act statute that refused to allow a candidate's name to go on the ballot for spending more than allowed by law was adding provisions of disqualifications not mentioned by the Constitution and was void.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In view of the description given by the gentleman from Texas of the horrid conditions prevalent in his State, may I inquire what political party is in the majority there?

Mr. McFARLANE. Well, the State went for Hoover in 1928, but that will not happen again. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact it is not a horrid condition that prevails down there. It is just democracy of its kind asserting itself, such as you have in many other States; and if we can enact legislation on this subject, we think we can further correct the situation.

Mr. DIES. Does not the gentleman believe that if we set a good example here in Washington maybe the Legislature of Texas will follow suit?

Mr. McFARLANE. I am hoping that may be true.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield for a short observation?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAVERICK. My district had a Republican Representative in Congress for 14 years and I may say he was a good Congressman too. There are a great many Republican voters down there in Texas. There are many Republicans in my own district; I mention this for the benefit of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am wondering whether the same question which was just propounded might not be asked rela-



tive to the State of Maine, where some 25 men had money given to them by the utility and holding companies back in 1930, as disclosed in an Interstate Commerce report. I guess there is no question about what party was in power then in the State of Maine, but there is some question now, thank God. [Laughter and applause.]

#### SPECIAL INTERESTS LOBBYISTS ALWAYS WORK NATION-WIDE

Mr. McFARLANE. In answer to the gentleman let me say it is well known that the special interests have taken a very active part in politics. They have done this in my State and I take it they have taken the same active part and interest in the politics of the different States of the Union, perhaps no more or no less than in Texas.

#### MOST IMPORTANT LEGISLATION WE CAN ENACT

Mr. Chairman, if we had had an adequate antilobby legislation law in effect since the World War, so that the Congress could have had complete information on the background of all lobbyists and paid propaganda of all kinds that floods Washington, I do not believe we would have had the depression in which we now find ourselves. I believe that much of the special interests legislation written into law would have been prohibited. The many pieces of special-privileged legislation such as the tariff laws, amendments to the banking laws, procurement laws, and tax laws would have been strongly amended for the benefit of the masses of the people.

#### THE MONEY TRUST LOBBY

As it is, for example take this administration, and go back even to the Banking Act of 1935, which we find was a compromise measure, as finally written which leaves under the control of the five presidents of the Reserve banks the right to largely control the open-market operations of the banks of the Nation which allows them through the purchase and sale of Government bonds to largely contract and expand the credit of the Nation and thus to regulate the value of money and cause future panics. Other similar amendments to the law favor private banking at the expense of the Government.

A later illustration was the recent second consideration of the bill to permit the preferred stock of national banks in the hands of the R. F. C. to be exempt from taxation by the States and local subdivisions thereof. We defeated this legislation on February 25 only to find the lobby reorganizing to come back and enact it March 19.

#### THE POWER TRUST LOBBY

The second strongest lobby is the Power Trust. We had a fair illustration of their power in the tremendous battle waged last session by the Congress in trying to enact adequate regulation of the utility-holding companies under the Wheeler-Rayburn utility bill.

You will remember how the Congress fought from January until August trying to enact adequate legislation on this subject and finally were forced to accept a compromise in order to get any legislation on this subject. It is well known that the Power Trust who admittedly are collecting about \$1,000,000,000 annually in the Nation beyond what is considered a fair rate for the electricity consumed have determined to defeat any and all Members of Congress who voted against them on this legislation. Since under our inadequate rate regulatory laws the Power Trust is able to spend unlimited amounts of money in political campaigns and charge these expenditures up as part of their overhead expenses and thus make the consuming public pay for them, should cause the American people to rise up in their might and insist upon adequate laws on this subject to stop this kind of high-powered racketeering.

#### POWER TRUST PROPAGANDA AT WICHITA FALLS

Coming a little closer to home, we find that the Power Trust dailies at Wichita Falls are now wailing long and loud about being oppressed and insulted because the Black investigating committee inspected their telegrams and because two Government inspectors were sent to check up on the February 8 municipal-light-plant election. I see no reason why the Power Trust dailies crowd should feel outraged. They did all within their power to defeat the rights of the people to secure lower light rates even to the extent of send-

ing Mr. J. H. Allison to Washington to try to block the project. Failing in that, they misrepresented all the facts they could to defeat the election, and now that the truth is fairly well known to the people in Wichita Falls as to how the election was bought, they try to act like they are outraged about the exposure. They say that "snoopers" should not be allowed to tell the truth about them. They have made so many complaints about what they allege to be the unfairness of the P. W. A. investigators' report on the February 8 election that additional investigators have been sent down to check the report and see if any errors have been made. So it seems that the "snoopers" are all right if sent at the instance and request of the Power Trust crowd. I predict that when the people of Wichita Falls and elsewhere realize how they have been duped by the Power Trust through their paid hirelings, and their misrepresentations and falsehoods scattered, that they will rise up and demand legislation that will put a stop to such tactics and will permit free people to operate and manage their Government for the benefit of all the people rather than the privileged few.

Many other special interests' lobbies now functioning before Congress could be mentioned, but time will not permit.

Now, I have a few amendments I expect to offer to this bill. One amendment will be on page 6 in regard to disclosures with respect to certain publications.

It was disclosed recently, as I mentioned here on the floor of the House, that no record is required to be kept of radio broadcasts. Speeches are not required to be filed under our Federal Communications Act, and there is no such requirement by the Commission. The radio stations are not required to file any report of broadcasts made. I believe we ought to require that a report of any broadcast made to influence legislation should be filed as other information is required to be filed under this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

#### LOBBYING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this proposed bill, it will not prevent anyone from talking to a Member of Congress about any proposed legislation, whether he is interested in its adoption or its defeat, provided, of course, he is not accepting, soliciting, or collecting funds from some other person or corporation for the purpose of influencing such legislation. If I am wrong about this, I hope some member of the committee will speak up and say I am wrong.

Mr. FULLER. I can tell the gentleman that he is wrong.

Mr. PATMAN. Where is the provision in the bill?

Mr. FULLER. Section 7, page 6:

any person who shall accept employment for any consideration to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of any pending or proposed legislation or appropriation.

Mr. PATMAN. I know what the gentleman has in mind. That refers to employment. If they are employed, certainly, they are representing another person or corporation. They would not be employed by someone else if they were not representing some other person or corporation. Therefore, the bill does not include any person who visits your office for any purpose on earth in regard to the adoption or the defeat of legislation, unless that person is collecting, receiving, or soliciting funds from some other person or corporation in order to assist him in placing this proposal before such Member of Congress.

Mr. FULLER. I cannot agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. I know I am right about that.

Mr. FULLER. I cannot agree with the gentleman because the gentleman cannot find language in the bill to substantiate what he is saying.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman pointed out the provision referring to employment. I have the bill here and the gentleman can read it over himself.

Mr. FULLER. I know what it does.

#### HIDDEN AND CORRUPT LOBBIES BROUGHT OUT INTO THE OPEN

Mr. PATMAN. All in the world this bill does is to bring out into the open hidden and corrupt lobbies. It is true



that some good lobbies will be involved. You cannot bring out all the crooks before the public view unless you inconvenience a few innocent people. The innocent people should not object to this if it is for a good purpose.

I have been chairman of a special committee investigating lobbies in different States, and here is the policy that they pursue. They first hire some person in the State with influence. They do not care whether he is a good lawyer or not. They will pay him sometimes on a contingent basis, paying him \$2,500 to stay there during the session of the legislature, with a provision that if he succeeds in stopping the bills they want stopped they will give him \$2,500 more at the end of the session.

They are sometimes employed on a contingent basis. If they were known, possibly, such persons would not be able to suggest certain amendments and have influence.

The way to defeat legislation in Congress or in the legislature of a State is to get some person who is innocent, myself or yourself, convinced that certain amendments should be inserted in a bill. We have not studied the amendment like the person who tells us about it. We think offhand it is all right. We go ahead and get the amendment in there, and maybe it destroys the bill or causes the bill to be held unconstitutional.

Under this proposed law the people who are around here suggesting these amendments and endeavoring to influence committees and Members of Congress will be required to register. We will know whom they represent, we will know where they are getting their money, and when they come to us asking us to suggest certain amendments and do certain things, we can still listen to them and tell them that we shall be glad to give the amendments consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 more minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. We will still listen to them, if we desire to give their views consideration, but we will know their interest in the matter and we will take their interest into consideration.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. In just a moment. So, after all, this is just a matter of bringing hidden and corrupt bodies out into the open.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot yield right now.

We had one situation before this committee where it was shown that a certain organization known as the "Cornstalk Brigade" had a lobbyist who was paid big money. The corporations had gone in together and paid him an enormous sum. He was to go out and get certain farm leaders—innocent they were—get them to do certain things, go to the State legislature and tell the members certain things about the legislation, hoping to get it defeated.

If that lobbyist had been required to register, these people would not have been misled and the members of the legislature would not have been misled.

The same situation will apply here. It will bring them out into the open. If the man is honest, he does not care, he will put his name on the book, on the register. There are going to be good lobbyists and bad lobbyists. This brings out the facts, so you may know who they represent.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Briefly, as my time has almost expired.

Mr. McFARLANE. What does the gentleman think about the lobby situation in Texas?

Mr. PATMAN. I wish we had an effective lobby law there. But that does not affect the legislation here. I am for an effective law for the Congress of the United States, for the protection of the public, for the protection of the Members of Congress as well. Not that we will ever be bribed or influenced; I am not afraid of that. Members of Congress are influenced, sometimes improperly, when they do not know it. If we knew the interests behind the person who is seeking to influence the passage or defeat the legislation,

Members of Congress and the public would be in a better position to protect themselves. This bill is to protect Members of Congress and the public as well.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that there is an antilobbying bill known as the Black bill. What is the difference between that legislation and this bill under consideration, if the gentleman is familiar with it?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not familiar with the Black bill; but this bill, it occurs to me, is a good bill. It will not restrict anybody's rights. Anyone will still have the right to ask a Member of Congress to vote for or against a bill. This will only affect those who are working for some other person or corporation where they are soliciting or receiving money. I hope the bill will pass and become a law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, one of the most dangerous forces in this life of America have been influences within the Government.

This measure as now written brings into the open all the influences outside of the Government which seek to influence legislation, but it does not include the bureaucracies which have been created in the last several years. More than \$7,000,000,000 has been turned over to these inexperienced and nontechnical gentlemen for disbursement. Much of this has been used unwisely. It is stated that some of it has been used to influence legislation. Let me give you an illustration: Last year a bill was pending before one of the House committees that had for its purpose the establishment of a public-works department, which would take over all of the public works of America and put them under the Secretary of the Interior. The bill was defeated in committee, largely by Democratic influence, but while the bill was pending, the minions of Honest Harold Ickes, went to and fro among members urging them to support the bill, talking knowingly about public works in their several districts. Ickes then had the spending of some four billions of dollars. He held the purse strings of our Government for this purpose of protecting the membership of the House against such influence. I propose to offer an amendment to the bill at the proper time as follows:

Excepting that no public official shall use the power or patronage of his office for the purpose of influencing legislation.

This amendment, if adopted, will protect Congress from a greater temptation perhaps than the temptation from without. It will protect the integrity of the legislative branch of government. I am for this bill. I will be for any bill of this general nature which bears the name of my distinguished colleague from Virginia, Judge SMITH. The amendment I propose will insure that the bureaucrats who are vested with temporary power, with the disposition of billions of dollars, shall not use that power within the law for the purpose of making over the pattern of this Government or for the purpose of boring from within.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I cannot yield now as I have only 5 minutes. I trust the Members on both sides of the aisle, mindful of this peril, this ever-living peril of bureaucracy, will support this amendment to the end that this Republic may not be destroyed from within.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the principle involved in this bill. As a matter of fact, I am in hearty accord with it, but there are certain inherent dangers in this bill, involving such groups as labor organizations, unemployment organizations, and farmers' organizations, that I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill certain questions on that particular phase. For instance section 6 defines what organizations must comply—those having for their purpose:



(a) The enactment or defeat of any legislation or appropriation by the Congress of the United States or the repeal or nonrepeal of any existing laws of the United States, or adoption or defeat of any amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(b) To influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation or appropriation by the Congress of the United States.

Under section 2 they must file a list of contributors and contributions of any amount or of any value whatsoever. Throughout the United States there exist many so-called unemployed organizations, organizations composed of the unemployed, whose contributions amount to perhaps no more than 25 cents a month. These organizations are interested in legislation before Congress. They are interested in adequate appropriations for relief, both direct and work relief. My question is, Would such organizations be compelled to file the names and addresses of any members making any such contribution or contributions of any value whatsoever?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; unless their principal purpose is to influence legislation or to influence directly or indirectly the election or defeat of any Federal officer.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is not that rather vague? Some organizations may have a different principal purpose tomorrow from what they have today. Let us say that an organization is today in existence for the simple purpose of petitioning Congress for adequate relief appropriations?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If that is the principal purpose of the organization, if the principal purpose is to influence legislation, it does not make any difference what the organization is.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Their purpose is to bring about adequate appropriations for relief. They would be required to file according to section 2. In other words, they would be required to give a full list of the 10-cent and the 25-cent contributions? Does not the gentleman think that is a rather absurd situation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not. If they are organized for that specific purpose, for the purpose of trying to influence legislation, whether their sums are made up of a few contributors of large sums or of many contributors of small sums, I do not see that it makes a great deal of difference.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It does for the reason that if you are going to compel an organization of the unemployed, with a membership perhaps of 50,000 or 100,000, whose contributions are in nickels and dimes, to comply with the provisions of section 2 of your bill, what you are accomplishing here is merely hampering minorities of unemployed and propertyless people, men without money or privileges at all in their petitioning Congress. In other words, you are aiming at the real lobbyist of special privileges. You miss him and you hit the unemployed and labor organizations. Unless this bill is amended, that is just what you are doing.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the gentleman is unduly worried about the actual working out of the matter.

Of course, the organization that collects 25 cents in dues usually has a record of its membership, and so forth, but where they take up collections of nickels and dimes, of course, it probably will be impossible to have the individual contributions. They would say they took up a collection at such-and-such an occasion and collected so much money.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Very well, then why should there be any serious objection to fixing a specific amount, say, of \$5, under section 2, instead of saying "of any value whatsoever"?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. My thought was, as I stated before, that, no matter whether a few people are contributing large sums or many people are contributing small sums, the public ought to know where the money is coming from.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is just what I was referring to. The result will be that you will know very little about the money behind privileged interests and you will expose contributors to the causes of labor and the unemployed to all sort of intimidation. Why not be realistic about this matter? Why has not the House committee adopted the Black bill, which does a real job on the lobbyist of entrenched interests? What you are doing is hampering or-

ganizations such as the unemployed, from effectively petitioning Congress.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. You are not hampering them. You may be putting them to a lot of detail accounting. I agree with the gentleman that far.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; but the organizations which we are really after, representing privileged interests, which come here to promote legislation, have accountants and a number of clever specialists to prepare their reports, and they will always present reports keeping them within the law, but if you want to get at some unemployed group you can very easily strike at them through this bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am not talking about any unemployed group.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is what I am interested in.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It does happen, and it is happening right now, that a greater total amount is being collected in dimes than in dollars.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Even so, it is about time that the underprivileged got together and contributed for their own benefit. They have just as much right to use nickels and dimes as the "big boys" have to use their hundreds and thousands. In those cases where they are collecting nickels and dimes, the cause for which they are fighting, whether it is right or wrong, irrespective of the merits of the cause, is not for the special privileged property and financial interests. What you should be aiming at is to compel the lobbyists for the privileged interests to sign up and register and throw light on their activities. They constitute the real evil we should get at. When you compel a list of the contributors of the unemployed organizations to be registered, or even that of a labor union, you are exposing those lists to their enemies, whose lobbyists we should eliminate.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Now, will the gentleman tell me why any unemployed should be contributing a nickel to anybody, and what form of human being ever took a nickel from the unemployed? There are plenty of people ready to champion them without taking nickels and dimes from them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That should be true, but experience has taught the unemployed, the farmers, and labor that to rely on their so-called friends is futile. They are better off when they rely on themselves, on their own collective action. This united collective action requires money for organizational purposes, literature, and other necessary expenses. Unity and a good war chest will bring these masses real results. They are contributing to themselves. This policy of self-reliance is better than expecting anything from "friendly" politicians.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have never heard of an unemployed having contributed a nickel or a dime or a quarter. If they do, the people who take the money ought to be put in jail, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The unemployed are not contributing for anybody else's benefit but for their own. They need bigger and better organizations. Their nickels go for literature and for the distribution of that literature and for newspapers of their own. They have just as much right to contribute their nickels and dimes to fight for their cause as the big politicians or the big industrialists have to collect their thousands of dollars to influence Congress. The people who should be in jail should be those who refuse adequate relief and not the leaders of the jobless.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Now, can the gentleman give us a concrete case of where anybody collected money from the unemployed for any purpose?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Just now all I know is this, that the various unemployed organizations are contributing nickels and dimes for literature, to be distributed among the unemployed and to send to the Members of Congress and to send to the various influential citizens of the community. They are building their own organizations. Have they not a legal and ethical right to do this?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That has nothing to do with this bill.



Mr. MARCANTONIO. Oh, they would have to register and give a list of everybody who gives a nickel or a dime, when they organize for the purpose of petitioning Congress. The proponent of this bill does not even deny that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

LOBBY LEGISLATION GOOD—TEXAS NEEDS IT, TOO

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I am especially interested in this bill because I come from the State of Texas, where we have no similar legislation, where the big corporations dominate the State, and where lobbyists go wholly unrestrained; where they do practically as they please.

In considering lobby legislation let us consider it as it applies to all types of organizations, including those devoted to labor. I have studied the labor movement a great deal. I know there has been crookedness in labor organizations, in radical organizations, just as there has been crookedness in conservative organizations. I am not saying that to please the conservative organizations, but it was found in Chicago and in other places that there were labor leaders who were shadily making from forty to seventy-five thousand dollars a year. We ought to know, if it is a labor organization or any other kind, where the money is coming from. We are entitled to know, and so is the public. I think this type of legislation will lead to tracing a great many things that we want to know. For instance, every now and then somebody rises and roars that the American Civil Liberties Union, of which I am a member, is getting money from Moscow. You know everybody has to use the word "Moscow" when they have not got any brains or have not got anything to say. It is just an alibi. The American Civil Liberties Union spent \$40,000, the American Liberty League spent around \$400,000—each in the year 1935—and the first one defended many friendless people in their rights under the Constitution; the latter, none. This should be known, but in both cases the sources of funds should be available for the public.

LOBBY LEGISLATION SHOULD APPLY STRICTLY TO ALL TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS

When such a bill as this becomes law every organization—labor, industry, business, commerce, or the unemployed—will be required to furnish information that will give the whole background to movements of all kinds in this country. In Germany Hitler fooled the people, but he could never have done it without the money of the reactionaries and munitions makers. Had the people known, he might not have come to power. This bill should apply to all—radicals, too; and we will know where they get their money. The principle, at least, will protect all honest citizens. This is a reasonable proposition; it works on all classes of people; and I do not see any reason why an organization of unemployed, an organization of liberals, an organization of radicals, whatever they may be called, should not be put on the same basis as the Liberty League. Now, I like to get up here and say hard things—and true, by the way—about the Liberty League. I do not like what they do, and I should like to destroy their organization. I consider them to be as arrogant and as ignorant as the French nobility; but it would be both arrogant and ignorant of me to deny them their full civil rights or to require reports from them, but not from labor and unemployed organizations; but I want to do it with truth. Every organization that operates with lobbyists in this country should be willing to give the truth to the people of the United States, not because we as Congressmen particularly want to put somebody in jail, not because we are afraid we cannot take care of ourselves, but because we want the American people to know the truth.

I just want to get these few words in about my own State. I do not have to tell you about the greatness of my State; it is the greatest State, the largest State, in the Union. We have fine large trees, high cactuses, beautiful sunsets, pretty moonlight, and all that; but we have myriads of lobbyists, too. We have some crooked lobbyists. We have utility lobbyists, we have great corporations, owned outside

the State, robbing us of our natural resources; and as I said before, they just about run the State of Texas. Although this is Federal legislation, it will help every State, including Texas. I hope we will pass this bill for the benefit of the people of the Union and to give my people back in Texas a good example. [Applause.]

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to declare in favor of the bill before the House. I have been convinced for quite some time that something must be done to bring under control this pernicious lobbyist element which is so much in evidence here in the city of Washington. I do not much care how we do it, just so we can accomplish what we set out to do. There are altogether too many cheap lawyers here whose practice is about on a par with petit larceny, who would starve to death anywhere but in Washington. When a bill comes up, no matter whether it is good, bad, or indifferent, these men with their special connections immediately send wires to your home town and my home town and create a panic by telling our legitimate industries and organizations that their liberties are at stake, or that they are about to be destroyed; and immediately you receive an avalanche of telegrams and appeals, followed by delegations that come to call on you. Frequently legislation that is intended for the best interest of all the people is defeated or emasculated in such way as to be made absolutely worthless. In the absence of any disturbing legislation this slimy element frequently tries to introduce sandbag legislation which it later agitates against and thus it creates an atmosphere of doing something to protect either legitimate industries or organizations. Thus they justify their existence and continue to draw big retainers and fees. Their service is worthless; they are not needed. They should have to go.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] expressed concern about organizations of labor and the unemployed. I am not afraid the interests of the unemployed will be jeopardized under this bill, and I am confident that my labor friends and board of commerce element in Detroit will be willing to register if they qualify as lobbyists. This bill is not intended in any way to compromise such people or organizations, to restrict their efforts, or to prevent their working for a good bill or against a bad bill, as they may see it; it is for the purpose of knowing the scoundrel who seeks to influence legislation. He is the only one who has any reason or cause for concern.

I am not at all fearful about my board of commerce element or about the Detroit Federation of Labor or the American Federation of Labor or any church organization or any honorable element that is interested in legislation. They will be willing, if they come here as lobbyists, to register; they will be willing to uncover, to work in the open. It is the scoundrel permanently here or who comes here to sell you in what seems to be a disinterested way, and the man who would compromise you, that this bill is aimed at. These are the men we want to put on record. The professionals who will work for any cause or for any element, good or bad, just so they are paid for their services.

I do not see how any Member of this House can honestly and conscientiously object to this legislation. I am not certain that it goes far enough. I am positive of one thing, the bill is not perfect; but it is not the only time a first attempt has not produced perfection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my Michigan colleague.

Mr. DONDERO. Suppose the president of a corporation in the gentleman's district should come to Washington and talk to the gentleman about legislation; does the gentleman think he ought to register before he talks to the gentleman?

Mr. DINGELL. No; and I do not believe he has to register under the terms of this bill. My colleague from Kentucky tells me he does not have to register.

Mr. DONDERO. I call the gentleman's attention to section 7, which states that the provisions of this section shall not apply to any person who merely appears before a com-



mittee. No one else is excluded, everybody else is included. Does the gentleman think it should be left this way?

Mr. DINGELL. It also indicates he must be employed, and I assume that means employed for the express purpose of lobbying and does not apply when he comes down here to protect himself.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman would not object to an amendment to clear up that situation?

Mr. DINGELL. No. I believe the committee is anxious to protect everyone under this bill. I believe they want to protect anyone who may come here to ask a Congressman or a group of Congressmen to consider certain action in reference to some particular legislation that may be pending. I assume the bill will exclude nonprofessional lobbyists, seeking to protect themselves and their interests.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the use of offering a clarifying amendment when it is already admitted that the bill would not apply to such a situation as the gentleman has stated? There is no need for a clarifying amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. I may say to the gentleman from Alabama that I am not familiar with every detail of the bill; however, I am confident that the committee is willing to agree to such clarifying amendments as may be necessary to protect honorable individuals and organizations as may be interested in certain legislation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act—*

(a) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or any thing of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make contribution;

(b) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or any thing of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure;

(c) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons;

(d) The term "Clerk" means the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of every person who shall in any manner solicit or receive a contribution to any organization or fund for the purposes hereinafter designated to keep a detailed and exact account of—

(1) All contributions of any amount or of any value whatsoever;

(2) The name and address of every person making any such contribution and the date thereof;

(3) All expenditures made by or on behalf of such organization or fund; and

(4) The name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made and the date thereof.

(5) It shall be the duty of such person to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure of such funds exceeding \$10 in amount, and to preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of at least 2 years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: On page 2, line 16, after the word "contribution", insert "in excess of \$5 in amount or value."

On page 2, line 20, insert "in excess of \$5 in amount or value."

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to this amendment. The bill in its present form requires that each person or organization receiving any money shall, in accordance with the terms and conditions of this bill, keep an accurate and complete record of each and every contribution regardless of amount, together with the name of the contributor. There are a large number of organizations that are collecting money, and within their constitutional right, for the purpose of influencing legislation. I know there will be no attempt on the part of the membership of this House to deprive such organizations of their right to function.

They have the right to collect money from interested persons and to present their views to the Congress of the United States.

I think, however, it is advisable to keep an accurate record of the names of those people who are supporting such organizations through large contributions. But it seems to me ridiculous to expect an organization such as the Townsend plan, we will say, or the Father Coughlin organization, or any of these others, to keep a record of everyone who contributes a dime or a quarter or some other small amount. I believe such organizations should make an accounting of the aggregate amount received. If they receive a hundred thousand dollars a year, the public is entitled to know that fact, but certainly it is unimportant to know whether Bill Jones or John Smith contributed 25 cents or 50 cents.

Mr. Chairman, I think the purposes of this bill could well be met if we required them to keep an account of the aggregate amount collected, but when it comes to keeping a record of the names of contributors, we should require them only to keep a list of those who contribute \$5 or any amount in excess of that sum.

Mr. CREAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. I believe the gentleman is a little high in his figure. Let us make it \$4.98.

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not know whether the gentleman is being facetious or not, but it does seem to me ridiculous to ask the Townsend organization to submit a list of everybody who pays 10 cents a month dues. I want to say right here and now that I am not offering this amendment for the purpose of advocating the Townsend plan, because I believe it is obnoxious, and I believe it is wrong.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The statement of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] about \$4.98 is not at all facetious. There is a serious part of the question which he raises. The gentleman from Wisconsin is endeavoring by his amendment to provide a loophole. If it is under \$4.98, it will be all right to lobby without registering.

Mr. BOILEAU. No; the gentleman is in error. It means that the organization who collects funds must keep a record of the name of contributors of \$5 or more. They still have to register, and would have to do so in either event.

Mr. DINGELL. If anything is paid in for the purpose of lobbying, they would not have to report it?

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman is in error. This amendment is such that if they collect any amount, regardless of what it may be, they will have to register. The bill in its present form, however, requires them to keep a list of everybody who contributes, even a penny. They have to record the name of the person, and that, it seems to me, is ridiculous. If it should be required that they keep a record of the names of those who contribute any sums in excess of \$5, that should be sufficient. Certainly there is not going to be any great amount of corruption on the part of persons who contribute such small amounts.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Committee to give this amendment its serious consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has raised a question with reference to the Townsend organization making a report. I do not believe the objection upon that score is applicable at all, because that is the basis and foundation of the Townsend plan. They want everybody to make a report on every transaction and certainly they will not object to reporting 10 cents or a quarter. I am sure therefore that group will not offer a strenuous objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGORY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. I hope the gentleman understands that my amendment will still require the Townsend organization



or any other organization to keep a record of the aggregate amount of receipts. My amendment only provides that they will not have to list the names of everyone who contributes a dime or a quarter. Under the present provisions of the bill they might have to report millions of names, and it would not be of any particular benefit to the Congress because no one would be interested in knowing who contributed such small amounts.

Mr. GREGORY. How would the gentleman find out what the aggregate contribution was unless he knew something about the source of the contribution? Would there not be quite a loophole there affording an opportunity for incorrect reports to be made unless we required the name and address of those who had made the contributions which made up the aggregate fund reported?

Mr. BOILEAU. If we take the Townsend organization as an illustration, the Townsend Club in the gentleman's district or in mine that contributes \$50 to national headquarters would have to be listed as a contributor.

Mr. GREGORY. As defined in lines 11 and 12, on page 2, if it is a fund for the purpose hereinafter designated, which is outlined on page 5, in section 6, and if they do these things for this purpose, then they ought to report, and there should be no exemption of anyone.

Mr. BOILEAU. My only object is that we may have an effective antilobbying bill. I am as anxious to have such a bill as the gentleman or any other Member of the House, but it seems to me we are tying this down so it will be ridiculous, and I may say, with all deference to the committee, I do not think this matter has been given sufficient consideration, and it seems to me we are asking too much to require all these small contributions to be listed here with the name of the contributor. It is not going to be helpful to the Members or anyone else to know whether these individuals contributed 25 cents or 50 cents.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, it is very important to retain this section as written. The committee has given very careful consideration to the matter, and I hope the committee will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU and Mr. SCOTT) there were—ayes 21, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Every individual who received a contribution for any of the purposes hereinafter designated shall within 5 days after receipt thereof render to the person or organization for which such contributions were received a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution and the date on which received.

Sec. 4. Every individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons receiving any contributions for the purposes hereinafter designated shall file with the Clerk between the first and the tenth day of each month, a statement containing complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing—

(1) The name and address of each person who has made a contribution of any size or value not mentioned in the preceding report; except that the first report filed pursuant to this act shall contain the name and address of each person who has made any contribution to such organization during the preceding 6 months;

(2) The total sum of the contributions made to or for such person or organization during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (1);

(3) The total sum of all contributions made to or for such organization or person during the calendar year;

(4) The name and address of each person to whom an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of \$10 or more has been made by or on behalf of such person or organization, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(5) The total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such organization during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (4);

(6) The total sum of expenditures made by or on behalf of such organization during the calendar year;

(7) The statements required to be filed by subdivision (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU:

Page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out "organization" and insert "person."

Page 3, line 23, strike out "or organization."

Page 4, lines 6 and 7, strike out "or organization."

Page 4, line 9, strike out "organization" and insert "person."

Page 4, line 12, strike out "organization" and insert "person."

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: Page 4, line 2, strike out "organization or."

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. A statement required by this act to be filed with the Clerk—

(a) Shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths;

(b) Shall be deemed properly filed when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and directed to the Clerk at Washington, D. C., but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such statement shall be promptly filed upon notice of the Clerk of its nonreceipt;

(c) Shall be preserved by the Clerk for a period of 2 years from the date of filing, shall constitute a part of the public record of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

Sec. 6. The provisions of this act shall apply to any individual, partnership, committee (except a political committee as defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act), association, corporation, or any other organization or group of persons who by themselves, or through any agent or employee or other persons in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicit, collect, or receive money or other thing of value to be used in whole or in part to aid, or the principal purpose of which organization is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes:

(a) The enactment or defeat of any legislation or appropriation by the Congress of the United States or the repeal or non-repeal of any existing laws of the United States, or adoption or defeat of any amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(b) To influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation or appropriation by the Congress of the United States.

(c) To influence, directly or indirectly, the election or defeat of any candidate for any elective Federal office.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 10, after the word "Act", insert a comma and the following: "and duly organized State or local committees of a political party."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to cure an oversight in the original draft of the bill, as I stated this morning to the gentleman from New Jersey. It was intended in the original draft to except political committees and those required to file under the Corrupt Practices Act. In going over it more carefully, we felt that there might be some misunderstanding about the meaning of that clause, and therefore I offer this amendment.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LEHLBACH. My attention was distracted at the moment the Clerk read the amendment. Will the gentleman state just what his amendment is?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It inserts the words "duly organized State or local committees of a political party."

Mr. LEHLBACH. After the word "act"?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. After the word "act."

Mr. FULLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FULLER. I notice that the committee accepted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU], in which it struck out the word "organization." What purpose does that serve, when on page 2, line 4, it says that the term "person" includes an individual, part-



nership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has discovered the reason why the amendment was offered and why it was accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 5, line 15, strike out the words "in whole or in part" and insert the word "principally."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the language of the bill on page 5, line 15, as it now reads is:

Solicit, collect, or receive money or other thing of value to be used in whole or in part to aid, etc.

The amendment proposes to change that language by striking out the words "in whole or in part" and by inserting the word "principally." The reason for that amendment is, it was brought to my attention, and I think to the attention of other members of the committee, that there were many organizations of national scope who have large memberships of thousands and some of millions of members organized principally for other purposes than affecting legislation, but many of those organizations do from time to time become interested in legislation, and they undertake to do something about it. It was not thought necessary or proper that that class of organization, because a minor part of its funds were devoted to purposes of influencing legislation, should be required to report all of the dues of their hundreds of thousands of members, and for that reason this amendment is proposed so that it would not apply except where the money is collected for the principal purpose of undertaking to influence legislation or the election of Federal officers, and I think it takes care of the question the gentleman from Wisconsin is interested in.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. I call the gentleman's attention to line 16 of that same section, where the word "organization" is used. Does not the gentleman believe that that should be changed to make it read "person", because there are others than organizations receiving money, and the word "person" would relate back to include organizations, associations, and so forth.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not think we object to that.

Mr. BOILEAU. I think it is important, because some individuals will be receiving money and it seems to me we want to include them. Also, in the first few words we have a repetition of the definition of the word "person." That is not so important. That can be changed in the interest of clarity, but it seems to me in line 16 it is vital that the word "organization" should be changed to "person."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I suggest that we dispose of the pending amendment.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. If the word "principally" is to be used here, the matter of the Townsend Club is suggested, and how can one tell whether their activities are principally to aid, and so forth? Would it not provide a loophole to let out some of these organizations?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think it would not if they are engaged in the activities mentioned in the bill.

Mr. McFARLANE. If we are to have the word "principally" in there should we not define it by saying at least one-half or three-quarters of their efforts, and so forth.

Mr. MILLARD. And who is going to determine this "principally" that is referred to?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Ultimately it will be determined by a court if someone is haled into court for violation of the terms of the act.

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope the gentleman will recognize the great danger there of defeating its purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 59, noes 18.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BOILEAU: Page 6, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is intended to strike out all of subsection (c), at the top of page 6:

To influence, directly or indirectly, the election or defeat of any candidate for any elective Federal office.

If this language remains in the bill, it will require that any person who advocates or attempts to influence, directly or indirectly, the election or defeat of any candidate for any elective Federal office must file in accordance with the provisions of this bill. If we look at the last section of the bill, section 10, we will find that it provides—

The provisions of this act shall not apply to any person now required by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to file such reports, nor be construed as repealing any portion of said Corrupt Practices Act.

In other words, this section I now direct attention to requires that any person who attempts to influence the election of any Federal officer must file under the provisions of this bill, while section 10 provides that he does not have to do it because of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. One provision puts him in and the other puts him out. It seems to me that that is not well considered and that this language should be stricken from the bill.

It is not my purpose to try in anyway to protect anybody who attempts to control an election. I think they should file under the Corrupt Practices Act. That certainly is not lobbying. When a man tries to influence the election of a Member of Congress or the President of the United States, he is not lobbying. He is campaigning. That is taken care of under the Corrupt Practices Act. Section 10 specifically exempts him from the operation of this bill, so why have him in here?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the gentleman's contention that the provision he has referred to in section 6 and section 10 are inconsistent?

Mr. BOILEAU. I think so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And contradictory?

Mr. BOILEAU. Contradictory to this extent, that lines 1 and 2 on the top of page 6 require persons who are attempting to influence, directly or indirectly, the election or defeat of any candidate for any elective Federal office to file. I am under the impression that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act now requires them to file. If so, section 10 exempts the same people that subsection (c) of section 6 tries to put into the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Is there not this distinction? Does not the Corrupt Practices Act simply require the candidates and the committees who expend money and who receive contributions as a party organization, to file those reports? Lines 8 to 17, on page 5, section 6, make it applicable to a person or to those organizations which go out and collect money independent of a political organization and independent of politics entirely, and simply open fire on a particular candidate?

Mr. BOILEAU. But he collects money and attempts to influence the election of Federal officers.

Mr. MILLER. That is true.

Mr. BOILEAU. I may be in error. Perhaps the Committee on the Judiciary has this information. I regret I do not have it.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. I will not use all of this time if we can get this matter clarified. I am satisfied that the Corrupt Practices Act provides that any person who collects or expends money for the purpose of influencing an election must file a report with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Does anyone dispute that? If I am in error, I would like to know it.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. DOBBINS. The gentleman is exactly right if the amount expended exceeds \$50 and is expended in more than one State.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is assumed. I assume no one is trying to investigate any huge organization that does not expend more than \$50 a year. So I believe the gentleman from Illinois will agree that this language is unnecessary?

Mr. DOBBINS. I believe it is necessary if section 10 is clarified as it should be. Section 10 is faulty as it is printed now.

Mr. BOILEAU. I appreciate it is faulty and should be corrected, but I believe this language should be stricken out in any event.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The bill seems to open up possibilities which perhaps were not intended, yet I am not sure that the thing I suspect is actually in it, but I want to ask the gentleman if, under section 6, paragraph (c), on the top of page 6, speakers employed by a national committee, who collect money from it, would fall under the terms of this act? I refer to political speakers. They influence directly or indirectly the election or defeat of a candidate, and they collect and receive money for doing it. They are paid as speakers.

Mr. BOILEAU. I believe the gentleman is absolutely correct in that respect. I presume that under the Corrupt Practices Act they would be obliged to specify that they paid John Jones \$200 a month for the purpose of campaigning in Arkansas, for instance.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. FULLER. But the gentleman will concede that it will get Dr. Townsend and Father Coughlin and the Liberty League? You will get them under this section, will you not?

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not think that helps at all, because such persons as are included in section 6 are also included in section 10.

Mr. FULLER. Those are the fellows we intend to catch up with by paragraph (c) in the first two lines. We do not want you to eliminate that.

Mr. BOILEAU. Anybody that section (c) brings within the scope of the bill is automatically kicked out of the bill under section 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin strikes at the very vitals of this bill. I think it strikingly illustrates the difficulty of undertaking to write a bill of this kind, or almost any other kind, on the floor of the House. As was stated this morning, almost every word of this bill has been given most careful thought as to interpretation and possible meaning by the Rules Committee, by two separate subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary and by subcommittees composed of both members of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the Rules Committee. Perhaps we have made some mistakes in the bill, in that we

have not been able to make as strong a bill as some of us would like to have had.

This bill undertakes to parallel the Corrupt Practices Act. The very purpose for which the bill was drafted was to bring in and make disclose their receipts and disbursements those organizations which are not now required to report under the Corrupt Practices Act. Let me explain: If the gentleman runs for Congress, or if I run for Congress, and we are supported by our committees, we have to file, under the Corrupt Practices Act, a statement of our receipts and disbursements. An organization may be formed, however, for the simple purpose of defeating Members of Congress. Under the law as it exists now, such an organization can raise all the money it is able to raise, can spend it freely in the gentleman's district or in my district, and account to nobody. The very purpose of this section to which the gentleman calls attention is to bring in this class of people; and the only reason there is the apparent conflict, to which the gentleman calls attention, is to distinguish this bill from the Corrupt Practices Act and to see that those who already are required to file reports under the Corrupt Practices Act do not have to duplicate their reports under this act. Strike these words out of the bill, and you strike out the very vitals of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are taking a lot of time on this bill, possibly rewriting the bill on the floor. It might be well for us to appreciate the parliamentary situation and what is going to happen. The Black antilobbying bill passed the Senate and came to the House; it was referred to the Judiciary Committee. The Smith bill originating in the House was referred to the same committee. The Judiciary Committee reported the Smith bill. The Smith bill is being rewritten here. It will pass the House—there is no question about it. It will go to the Senate, and then the work will commence.

The antilobbying bill, if there is one, will be written in conference after the passage of this bill. Many things have been agreed to here today; we have been going along nicely, adopting almost any kind of amendment. Some of us who have been here a number of years realize the procedure and know what it means. The mere adoption of an amendment on the floor does not mean a single thing. When the bill passes the Senate and goes to conference it will be rewritten. So do not be surprised if when the bill comes back you see the Black bill almost as it originally passed the Senate.

The pending bill is divided into two parts. The first six sections deal with these organizations about which we have heard so much today. This is the only purpose of the first six sections of this bill. Section 7 is a sort of consolidation of many of the meritorious points in the Black bill.

I call attention to these things in order that you may realize just what the situation will be when the bill comes back from conference. For my part, I cannot see much advantage in spending a great deal more time here today amending this particular bill, for I believe what we are doing now is futile.

I think we are all opposed to lobbying, as that word is significantly used throughout the country. My own experience teaches me, however, that there is very little pernicious lobbying in Washington. True, there are crooked lobbyists, but let us not forget that in reality all of these organizations interested in good government act in good faith, rightfully present their views, are honest, and should be given consideration. Personally I am not afraid of lobbyists. My office is always open to any citizen who wants to present his or her views on pending legislation. All wisdom does not repose in Members of Congress. Good and wholesome legislation comes from study and investigation, and much of the valuable information comes from organizations and interested individuals, who have given especial attention to the particular subject matter in which the group, or the individual, is particularly interested. We do not want to do anything to discourage or prevent this legitimate help. Our constituents should be encouraged to give us their views rather than prohibited from contacting us.



There are lobbying evils, yet we must not destroy the benefits of wholesome information in order to kill off a few violators. I can see no objection to legislative representatives of farm organizations, business organizations, labor organizations, or any other organizations having headquarters in Washington, being compelled to register. I have talked with several of them and feel that they have no objection. That is their business and that is why they are in Washington; there is no secret about it and no harm can come from it. On the other hand, I am hesitant about doing anything that might discourage the folks at home from writing to me, talking with me, or sending delegations to Washington in the interest of what they believe to be necessary and good legislation.

I do not want to do anything that will make it impossible for my conscientious constituents to meet and discuss their problems. If it becomes necessary, in their judgment, to take up a collection or make individual contributions in order that their views and reactions might be communicated to me, there is no necessity for a lot of bookkeeping and receipts on their part.

Of course, some so-called lobbyists do disreputable things, but we cannot make people honest by legislation. I realize that in these days of acquisition and demagoguery it is difficult to vote against anything that appears to strike at lobbying. Yet, I am sure that the good far outweighs the reprehensible so far as most of the information and propaganda coming to Congress is concerned. Undoubtedly, evils exist. We want to cure those evils, but it seems to me that the first six sections of this bill are so drastic that the right of petition on the part of the people will be denied in some instances. A reasonable, regulatory bill should be worked out, but the floor of the House is not the place to do it. May I hope that the Members of the House will give more careful consideration to the language of this bill as it goes to the Senate and, therefore, be in a position to act intelligently and definitely, when the bill comes back from conference?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: On page 5, line 16, strike out the word "organization" and insert the word "person."

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that this is the amendment to which I referred a little while ago. Does he object to the amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This amendment is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the members of the committee a question about section 7.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is much uncertainty as to whether or not one of the largest legitimate factors there is in the matter of influencing legislation is included. I refer to employees of newspapers and special writers. Section 7 reads, in part:

Any person who shall accept employment . . . to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation, etc., shall register, report expenses, pay, etc.

It seems to me the employees of newspapers might very well be considered to be within the provisions of this section. We certainly do not want to do anything like that. We do not want to affect this entirely legitimate means of influencing legislation. I am not sure, however, but that under the provisions of this section we are doing this very thing. I notice toward the end of the section certain exceptions are made, and I am wondering whether this section ought not to be clarified by the addition to the language now in the bill to the effect that this section shall not apply to any person who appears before a committee in support of or op-

position to pending legislation the following: "nor to employees of regularly published newspapers and periodicals"?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The very sentence the gentleman read, line 3, on page 6, starts with this language:

Any person who shall accept employment for any consideration.

If the newspaperman to which the gentleman refers is working for the newspaper, he is employed to set type, to edit the paper, or what not.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. But he is employed by the newspaper, and the newspaper attempts to influence legislation. We have four newspapers in the city of Washington which are continually hammering at us, influencing or attempting to influence legislation, and they should not be hampered.

Mr. MILLER. That is true; but that employee has not been employed for the purpose of influencing legislation; he has been employed to run a newspaper.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. The newspaper, in substance, hires its editors and pays them for the purpose, in many cases, of carrying out the policy of a publisher to influence legislation, as he views it, in the public interest.

The statute as written will force registration of a person hired to write an article for a newspaper directed against any pending bill, even if the writer did not come within 1,000 miles of Washington. Even if it does not apply to general editorial employees, it surely would apply to a special writer hired because of his knowledge and understanding of a legislative problem to discuss in the newspaper or magazine a bill pending in Congress. Surely we do not want it to apply to such situations. I think the bill should be clarified. In the case of regularly employed editors supporting or opposing legislation pending, it is not entirely clear that such editor was not employed for the purpose that his political writings indicate. I recall one writer who was brought here to expound in the press one economic principle then before Congress in a banking bill. He would have to register under this act.

The regular editorial writer has been employed to assist in running a newspaper which influences or attempts to influence legislation.

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me it is very clear now.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. But it is not stated in your bill that this man is employed for the sole purpose of assisting in running a newspaper. It is stated that if he is employed to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of legislation he must do certain things. Now, the newspaper is a corporation and cannot speak itself; it must speak through its editors.

Mr. MILLER. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this is a criminal statute, which will be strictly construed, and everything that is not prohibited by the terms of the statute will not be an offense. In other words, whenever a criminal act is defined, it is defined according to the substantive provisions of the law itself, and any act that is not prohibited is not included within the act.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. It seems to me it is a rather doubtful proposition, and I do not see why the gentleman should object to an amendment clarifying the situation.

Mr. MILLER. I do not object to it, but I do not see any necessity for the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I am not going to offer the amendment, but I trust the conferees will give some consideration to the fact that this bill is aimed at lobbying here in Washington and not at legitimate public criticism and discussion of legislation in the public press.

BLACK LOBBY BILL A GOOD ONE; BILLS SHOULD BE COMBINED

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I understand Senator BLACK has pending a bill on the subject of lobbying and that it is an excellent bill. I also understand that bill is considerably different from the House bill. I am not familiar with the technical differences. In any event, if the bill as passed by the Senate is much different from the House bill, may I ask the gentlemen who are proponents of the bill



what the parliamentary situation will be in reference to obtaining final passage, because we all want an effective piece of legislation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman wish me to answer that question?

Mr. MAVERICK. I will appreciate it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Section 7 of this bill contains the provisions of the Black bill as passed by the Senate as far as the Judiciary Committee felt justified in reporting it. Section 7 of the bill is the Black bill so far as the House committee concurred in the Senate bill. The rest of the bill is different.

Mr. MAVERICK. But what will be the parliamentary situation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If we pass this bill it will then go to the Senate and will there be referred to a committee. It will not go to conference. It will have to be passed by the Senate first.

Mr. MAVERICK. It will have to be reported by the committee over there, but will that not take a long time?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know.

Mr. MAVERICK. I just mention this matter, because we should get through an effective piece of legislation at an early date.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that will be accomplished.

Mr. MAVERICK. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. I trust my colleagues will forgive me for a more or less repetitious statement. I urge the proponents of this bill to get the parliamentary kinks out of the situation. Let us not have the situation of a Senate bill in the House and a House bill in the Senate, both lost in committees and never meeting each other. We should have a bill like that, and it should be effectively drawn up in such a way as to expose lobbying practices, whether good or bad, and any corrupt practices of any kind. We ought not to let good legislation be lost in a congressional shuffle.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. Any person who shall accept employment for any consideration to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of any pending or proposed legislation or appropriation by the Congress of the United States shall, before doing anything in furtherance of such object, register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and shall give to those officers, in writing and under oath, his name and business address and the name and address of the person by whom he is employed and in whose interest he appears or works as aforesaid, how much he is paid and is to receive, by whom he is paid or is to be paid, how much he is to be paid for expenses, and what expenses are to be included. Each such person so registering shall, at the end of each 3-month period, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk and Secretary aforesaid a detailed report of all money received and expended by him during such 3-month period in carrying on his work as aforesaid; to whom paid; for what purposes; and the names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person who merely appears before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or opposition to pending legislation and who engages in no further or other activities in connection with the passage or defeat of such legislation; nor to any public official acting in his official capacity.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CULKIN: On page 7, line 4, after the word "capacity", strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "except that no public official shall use or threaten to use the power of patronage of his office for the purpose of influencing legislation."

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I called the attention of the Members of the House a moment ago to the fact that the danger to the life of this Republic is not necessarily from without but from within. May I say that in the Continental Congress and afterward in the writings of Washington and Jefferson it was definitely impressed upon the people of the country by these great Americans that it was necessary to keep the separate divisions of the Government coordinated but apart.

We have witnessed in the past 4 years a tremendous delegation of power by Congress to the executive departments—sometimes to untrained men. I am not going to discuss that from the political angle, but merely state it. These men have been given the purse strings of government which under a popular dispensation belonged to this House. As the result of this great delegation of power they have become infested with delusions of grandeur and have attempted to rewrite the governmental pattern of America.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered permits their recommendations to be made, but makes it a violation of the statute if they use the patronage of their office for the purpose of influencing legislation. I could go into that phase of the matter in great detail, but will not do so at this time. May I say, however, particularly to you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, that you are not always going to be in power. Your power will be terminated by the people of the country in the coming November election. I am earnestly praying that it will. The proposed amendment is an anchor to the windward, as the sailors say, for you in the next administration, which is sure to be Republican in this House and Executive Mansion. May I say in all frankness that bureaucracies sometimes during Republican regimes have reached for power. But they never developed the boldness or success that they have under the auspices of the Democratic Party. The difference is that we Republicans never surrendered the purse strings to them. [Applause.] I am glad that you concur in that sentiment; and, in view of that alleged concurrence, I hope you gentlemen on that side will support my amendment, which, in my judgment, will make for the continuance of popular government in America.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, if the fond hope of the distinguished gentleman from the banks of the Oswego Canal should ever be realized, and the remote possibility should ever happen that his party as now constituted should regain possession of the Government, I can picture him offering such an amendment as this! Of course, it is a political amendment purely and simply. It is one of those Parthian thrusts at the administration or some of the officials of the administration, not to mention how ridiculous would be any attempt to carry it into effect or how difficult it might be to prove whether anybody ever gave patronage to influence legislation. From my own personal experience I am afraid I might be corrupted if the form of a bribe was offered to me. I have not been tempted, I am sorry to say, and I have an idea that no other Member has had the prize dangled before his eyes.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. May I interject the remark that I personally believe the gentleman is absolutely incorruptible by ecclesiastical or other influence. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think patronage is the only form of corruption to which I might knowingly submit, but I believe the amendment should be defeated because it is only a political gesture, offered in a spirit of merriment—I will not even say partisanship. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CULKIN) there were—ayes 33, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: Page 6, line 4, after the word "consideration", insert a comma and "or any administrative official of the Federal Government who visits the Capitol other than by invitation of a committee of either House."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I realize the hour is getting late and that you are impatient to get away, therefore, I shall try not to take the entire 5 minutes.



I am offering this amendment in good faith, at least to the extent of asking you to listen for just a moment. I believe you people who have been here in Congress a long time realize that the bureaus of the Government, like Tennyson's brook, go on forever.

I may say, without intending any reflection upon the younger Members of the House or those who have had less experience, that there are men in the bureaus who are better equipped, who have a more thorough knowledge, perhaps, of legislation and legislative tricks than the Members on the floor of the House. It is well known to the Members of the Congress that the inside lobbyist is the most dangerous lobbyist of all. There are corporations in this country that have their men in the present administration, as they have in other administrations, who hold key positions, who are in the most strategic positions to influence Congress. I think if the dairy interests of this House were to realize what is happening to them they would understand the implication of what I am saying.

It was not so long ago that we had a situation in the House that was in the headlines of every newspaper in the country. If I had the time I would read just a short bit of the testimony showing the arrogance of men connected with departments of the Government, walking into the lobbies of Congress, putting up charts and invading the Speaker's lobby and occupying every door of the Congress, button-holing Members with reference to the utilities. You have had an investigation of that matter. You know how far these inside lobbyists will go, and I believe it would be very wise to put in the bill the amendment I have offered here.

If you will read the proposed amendment in connection with the language of the section, you will realize it is not depriving them of coming to the Capitol unless they come here for the specific purpose of influencing legislation.

They can and they do go out into the various districts and with their propaganda attempt to defeat experienced Congressmen who are getting in their way, who are preventing them from obtaining large appropriations for their bureaus. They are delighted when they get a large number of freshmen in the Congress. To use plain language, they can make monkeys out of new Members and get all kinds of appropriations and privileges at the expense of the taxpayers of this country.

I believe this amendment will help the entire situation on both sides of the House if it is adopted. Now, just get the language as the bill would read with this amendment:

Any person who shall accept employment for any consideration, or any administrative official of the Federal Government who visits the Capitol other than by invitation of a committee of either House, to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of any pending or proposed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, we are sent here to legislate for our constituents, and we have seen the situation in the last few years—not alone, perhaps, in your administration—when bills have been written by these bureaucrats and handed to committees. They have even sat in executive sessions with the members of committees, and when any member undertook to state his views on the merits of the case hostile to the views of the inside lobbyists, within 24 hours the member was burned up with a deluge of propaganda. The departmental lobbyists had built the fires back home. It is time to stop such practices.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CONGRESSIONAL FRESHMEN NOT HALF-WITS AND NEED NO PROTECTION

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I notice the talk of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] was mainly about the poor freshmen who come to Congress and do not know anything. The gentleman stated that they needed protection from these wicked bureaucrats who come up here and lead us astray. If we presume that his amendment, which provided, in effect, no Government employee can talk to a Congressman about legislation without permission or invitation, is necessary, I would say that we freshmen in Congress are a bunch of intellectual half-wits. I have not been approached more than two or three times by members of the Government

concerning any legislation whatever, but when they did it was respectful, fair, open, and for the purpose of giving me information. Had it been otherwise, I would have thrown them out; and so would any other Congressman, no matter what party he belongs to.

I have asked for information at the Indian Bureau, I have asked for information at the Department of the Interior. I have asked from all departments, and I have always gotten it. These departments have been willing to give me necessary information and factual information concerning legislation and its effect. Naturally, when some situation arises, they explain certain matters of legislation to me, as they do to all Congressmen, and they ought to do it.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENTS SHOULD COOPERATE

Some gentlemen seem to think that the administrative branch of the United States Government are our enemies. The administrative branch is a part of the Government just as we are. The answer is, we should cooperate with each other in giving the people good government. Moreover, I consider myself intellectually able to withstand the political blandishments of a few men in any branch of the Government.

If the Republicans were in power they would not dream of offering any such amendment. It is a political rider to this bill. I think the gentleman from New York is serious because he looks serious, but I think the amendment is ridiculous.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

#### WHEREIN IT IS SHOWN IT IS NOT A SIN TO GAIN KNOWLEDGE

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman knows that recently it has been disclosed that persons in a department of the Government have written speeches for new Members of Congress to deliver over the radio.

Mr. MAVERICK. That may be an exaggeration, but why not? As far as I am concerned I am proud to have a "brain truster" give me information. For instance, I went to the Department of the Interior and worked all night with one of them to help me prepare a speech that I later delivered over the radio. And I knew what I was saying when I spoke over the radio. I have no contempt for knowledge and learning.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman tell the public how much was his and how much he got from the brain-truster?

Mr. MAVERICK. No; certainly not. Anyone has the right to get his information from where he can get it best. If you search the books and get scientific information, you do not say that 40 percent of it is yours and you got 60 percent out of the books. And if we discuss matters with men who have learning, we can improve ourselves. There is no patent on learning; I try to get it from everybody and everywhere. Anybody has a right to use research information. I do not think it a sin to gain knowledge from men who have it, and I make no bones about the fact that I give and receive information all the time. Only a fool would refuse to discuss matters with well-informed people.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do this for the purpose of directing a question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who offered this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY], a member of the committee.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHRISTIANSON) there were—ayes 61, noes 43.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].



The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CULKIN) there were—ayes 36, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members present, a quorum.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 3, after the word "legislation", strike out the semicolon and the remainder of the paragraph and insert a period.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: Page 6, line 20, after the word "purposes", strike out the remainder of the line and all of lines 21 to 23, ending with the word "editorials", in line 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFARLANE: Page 6, line 6, after the word "States", insert "or to influence any Federal bureau, agency, or Government official or Government employee, to make, modify, alter, or cancel any contract with the United States Government, or any United States bureau, agency, or official as such official, or to influence any such bureau, agency, or official in the administration of any governmental duty, so as to give any benefit or advantage to any private corporation or individual, shall."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment that it is not germane.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is taken verbatim from the Black resolution on this same subject that is before this committee, and it covers very fully and completely the situation that was considered by this same committee. It is the identical language included in the Black resolution on the antilobbying question before the Senate committee. I think it covers a very important phase of this subject clearly and fully and ought to be made a part of this legislation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Texas, although what he says may have been in the original Black resolution, there is nothing in the bill affecting anything except influence on the Congress of the United States and legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. Section 7 deals very definitely with legislation pending before Congress. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to which the gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order, is not germane to that subject, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFARLANE: Page 6, line 23, after the word "editorials", insert "and to furnish an exact copy of all radio broadcasts made concerning any proposed or existing legislation pending before the Federal Government."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFARLANE: Page 6, line 25, insert "or any Member of Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. Any person who violates any of the foregoing provisions of this act shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is being sponsored by the majority party. It is obvious it will pass, no matter under what conditions the vote is taken. I want to go on record as being unalterably opposed to the bill. It is safe to assume that a quorum will not be present when the vote is taken, but out of consideration for the feelings of my colleagues I shall not make that point of order at this late hour in the afternoon. I simply want to record myself as opposed to the bill, regardless of the manner in which the vote may be taken.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the last amendment that I offered was offered as an amendment to line 25, which added the words "or a Member of Congress." It is a corrective amendment and I think if the rule had not been put on closing the debate the committee would have at least accepted this amendment. It would make this provision then read as follows:

"The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person who merely appears before a committee of the United States Congress, or a Member of Congress."

As it is in the bill, it does not apply to one of your constituents who comes here to present a matter before a committee, but it may apply if he appears and talks with you personally about a piece of legislation in which he is interested, if for any consideration he should appear for himself or for someone else.

Certainly that is a corrective amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. It would not apply to that constituent unless he was employed for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLANE. This is an amendment that would release a constituent from the provisions of this bill. I understand it goes back to the proposition, if he appears before a committee of the Congress in support of or in opposition to any pending legislation. You certainly cannot read something into the bill that is not there, and if he so appears voluntarily and without compensation for a friend I believe the provision without the amendment I offer would require registration.

In regard to the other amendment that I did not have an opportunity to speak upon, as the bill now reads, it applies to certain papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or such editorials. That amendment made it also apply to propaganda and radio speeches advocating or opposing legislation pending before Congress, broadcast over the radio by these paid lobbyists. Under existing laws and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission it is not mandatory that any radio speeches be filed with anyone. I think all speeches as delivered should be filed with the Commission and available to the public. Certainly such an amendment as that should be placed in this bill. I am just rising at this time to call it to your attention because I did not have an opportunity to do so previously because debate was shut off before reaching my amendments.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I wish to query the proponent of the bill briefly. At the outset of this discussion the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] stated on the floor that during the progress of the bill he would offer an amendment which would, in effect, exempt farm cooperatives, labor unions, the Grange, and other similar types of organizations from the operation of the bill. I have listened and I have not heard such an amendment. Does the gentleman intend to offer it?



Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What I intended to say was that an amendment would be offered eliminating it from that section of the bill which required them to report all of their receipts and disbursements.

Mr. CULKIN. And that amendment has been offered?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; and it was adopted.

Mr. CULKIN. I am not seeking to give these groups an immunity bath, although the purposes of their organization are beneficial to the country, but section 3 would seem to make this unworkable as far as those organizations are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The amendment to which the gentleman has reference has been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. If any provision of this title or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act shall not apply to any person now required by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to file such reports nor be construed as repealing any portion of said Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dobbins: Page 7, line 14, strike out the words "any person now required" and insert in lieu thereof the words "practices or activities intended to be regulated."

In line 15, strike out the words "to file such reports."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to that amendment. It is a clarifying amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What it is intended to regulate is not the point.

Mr. DOBBINS. The reason for the inclusion of the words "intended to" is to meet a certain situation which might arise in a criminal case. Without the employment of those words the question might arise as to whether the particular and individual practice involved is covered by Corrupt Practices Act and that would then entail a judicial determination of the individual transaction rather than of such practices as a general class.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It does not sound like legislative language to me. The act either covers certain practices or does not. The gentleman's amendment should read "practices covered by the act." The gentleman should leave out "intended."

Mr. DOBBINS. I think it is more specific as I have written it, if the chairman please.

The purpose of the amendment is to make it impossible for a man to buy immunity from the provisions of the act by the expenditure of \$50. Section 306 of the Corrupt Practices Act provides that anybody who expends \$50 or more in influencing a national election and makes the expenditure in more than one State is required to file a report under that act. This section of the bill as here written would permit anyone who is required to file a report under the Corrupt Practices Act to escape all regulation by this so-called anti-lobbying bill.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. It is true, is it not, under the provisions of section 10 as originally written, a defeated candidate for Congress who as such filed a report under the Federal Corrupt Practices Act might turn lobbyist and by reason of this provision be exempt from the provisions of the act?

Mr. DOBBINS. Yes. Any candidate for Congress would be exempt from the provisions of the act as originally written, but they may be only a few hundred men, as against 120,000,000 persons who could buy immunity from the provisions of this proposed law by merely spending \$50 to influence a national election.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Anyone who spends \$50 to influence the election of a candidate for Congress under section 10 would be exempt.

Mr. DOBBINS. No; not to influence the election of just one Member of Congress. To bring the spender under the Corrupt Practices Act the money must be expended in more than one State.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Under the Corrupt Practices Act a Member of Congress must file statements of receipts and disbursements.

Mr. DOBBINS. Both the elected Members and the defeated candidates must file.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 11663, pursuant to House Resolution 462, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Virginia, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### SAN JUAN NATIONAL MONUMENT, PUERTO RICO

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the San Juan National Monument.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Military Order of the World War, Puerto Rico Chapter, with respect to H. R. 7931, "a bill to establish the San Juan National Monument, Puerto Rico, and for other purposes."

A companion bill, S. 2864, passed the Senate July 30, 1935, and is now on the Speaker's desk—table. I am hopeful that the committee will see fit to bring this measure before the House as soon as possible so that it may be disposed of before they adjourn.

MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WAR,  
PUERTO RICO CHAPTER,  
San Juan, P. R., March 19, 1936.

HON. SANTIAGO IGLESIAS,

Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. IGLESIAS: I am pleased to transmit herewith a resolution approved by the Puerto Rico Chapter, Military Order of the World War.

Yours sincerely,

M. G. MORALES, Chapter Adjutant.  
Resolution

Whereas, following a survey of the historical and architectural points of interest in the city of San Juan, Puerto Rico, by officials of the Government of the United States, it was recommended that this city be declared a public monument, and, as such, preserved and developed by the Department of the Interior of the United States under general appropriations made by the Congress for the national parks and monuments; and

Whereas Senate bill No. 2864 is pending consideration and passage in the Congress of the United States to materialize the plan establishing San Juan, Puerto Rico, as a national monument; and

Whereas the island of Puerto Rico is the only Territory under the jurisdiction of the United States where Christopher Columbus landed when he discovered the island in his second voyage to America in the year 1493; and

Whereas the city of San Juan has many historical and architectural points of interest which it is fitting to preserve as a memorial to an epic of the past and for the cultural and spiritual recreation of present and future generations; and



Whereas the national convention of the Military Order of the World War, held at Atlantic City on the 17th day of September, 1935, adopted a resolution in support of the plan, which resolution, unanimously passed, was presented by a delegate from the Puerto Rico chapter of the order; and

Whereas the Puerto Rico Chapter of the Military Order of the World War has knowledge of the fact that, although Senate bill No. 2864 has the support of many officials of the United States, it is, however, being objected to without sound or reasonable cause: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by a meeting of the Puerto Rico Chapter of the Military Order of the World War, held at San Juan, P. R., on January 9, 1936:*

1. In conformity with the action of the national convention of the order to request that the proper officials of the Government of the United States favorably consider and recommend the passage of Senate bill No. 2864 establishing the city of San Juan, P. R., as a national monument.

2. That a copy of this resolution be sent by the chapter adjutant to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; to the chairmen of the proper committees of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Blanton Winship, Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Honorable Santiago Iglesias, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico; and to Col. George E. Ijams, national commander of the Military Order of the World War.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the reading of the Journal, the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and the special order for the day I may be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the reading of the Journal, the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and the special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] prepared to tell us what legislation will be brought up and considered next week?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is expected that on Monday next we will take up a rule providing for the consideration of the bill pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. MAPES. And after that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. After that we expect to take up the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader if there will be a reduction in that appropriation bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I trust so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

#### CANCELANON OF MAIL CONTRACTS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution No. 238.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

#### Senate Joint Resolution 238

Joint resolution to extend the time within which contracts may be modified or canceled under the provisions of section 5 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934

*Resolved, etc., That section 5 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934, as amended, be amended by striking out "March 31, 1936" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 31, 1936": Provided, That the right of the United States to annul any fraudulent or illegal contract or to institute suit to recover sums paid thereon is in no manner affected by this joint resolution.*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] when this resolution was introduced and considered in the Senate?

Mr. BLAND. Today. It was reported by the Post Office Committee and brought up by Senator McKELLAR, considered by the Senate, and passed unanimously.

Mr. LEHLBACH. May I ask the gentleman further if he knows whether the Secretary of Commerce, any of his assistants, the Chief of the Shipping Board Bureau, the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of Commerce have ever seen this resolution, and whether they have expressed any opinion concerning it?

Mr. BLAND. The Secretary of Commerce had not seen it when I called him up. The Secretary of Commerce expressed himself as in favor of it after I brought it to his attention and said he thought it should pass.

Mr. LEHLBACH. What is the purpose of extending the President's control over these contracts for 60 days? The President has had these contracts under consideration for over 2 years and has made no move with respect either to their cancellation or modification. Consequently there cannot be anything very much wrong about these contracts.

Mr. BLAND. I am not discussing that question. The power of the President to cancel these contracts will expire on March 31. This resolution was prepared in the Post Office Department by Mr. Crowley. The Department insists it should be passed if we are to retain the power in the President which the President has now.

Mr. LEHLBACH. A similar resolution extending the President's control over ocean-mail contracts has been passed two or three times.

Mr. BLAND. It was extended first to October 1935, and then from October 1935 to March 1936.

Mr. LEHLBACH. If it is desirable to retain in the President control over these contracts, why cannot the usual course be followed and retain this control in the President until the next Congress meets instead of for 60 days? Has the gentleman any idea what is intended to happen within 60 days?

Mr. BLAND. I presume the Post Office Department had in mind the possibility of legislation. Inasmuch as the power will exist in the President to cancel at any time that he may see fit, I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, to extend it for a longer time. Of course, it would have to go back to the Senate if amended.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman accept an amendment extending the President's control over these contracts for 1 year?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. May I offer such an amendment?

Mr. BLAND. Of course, the power is in the President to cancel these contracts at any time. He could cancel these contracts tomorrow, a week from tomorrow, or 10 days from tomorrow. I think that is the only way we will get it through by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the real purpose of this action? I have listened to all this discussion and I do not see the real purpose. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. MORAN] is particularly interested in this matter, but he is not present.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLAND. I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection.

Mr. MICHENER. These important matters are brought in here at 20 minutes to 6 and then they talk about "these very important matters." We will be back Monday.

Mr. RICH. There are 3 days remaining before the end of the month and the gentleman may bring it up in that time.

Mr. BLAND. If it is to be amended, it will have to go back to the Senate for concurrence or conference. The



Post Office Department originally fixed this at March 17, and they suggested that I accept the amendment in order to get it through. Mr. Crowley has been one of those fighting the ocean-mail contracts matter. The Assistant Postmaster called me a few moments ago and told me he thought I had better accept the amendment and let it go to conference.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Members who spoke on the bill H. R. 11663 and all other Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### FLOOD CONTROL IN THE CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY—PRESENT AND FORMER FLOODS IN THE CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts from the report of the Natural Resources Board and also from the Chief of Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Speaker, the past 2 weeks witnessed the most destructive floods known in the history of some sections of the Northeast, causing death and destruction in Ohio, Maryland, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, and New England.

Rising flood waters of the Connecticut River and tributaries inundated farms, villages, and large sections of towns and cities. Everywhere through this great farming and industrial valley the raging waters of this river and its tributaries wrought havoc, ruin, death, and terror, destroyed and damaged churches, homes, personal property, railroads, lighting systems, commercial and manufacturing establishments, and almost brought to a complete stop the business life of this region.

Floods occur every year along the Connecticut River, as they do along most other rivers in our country. Some years find greater floods than other years, but because their intensity and extent are unpredictable and because real prevention measures have not been planned and undertaken, warnings to inhabitants to leave low sections and exposed places, and hasty and last-minute attempts to build bulwarks are of little avail.

The total and exact amount of damage in the area of the Connecticut River Valley caused by the present flood will never be known. Newspaper reports assert that this whole valley suffered between \$150,000,000 and \$200,000,000 damage and that the larger cities like Hartford and Springfield may have been caused as much as \$25,000,000 damage, while for smaller communities, like Middletown, the estimate is about \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000.

There are no exact estimates of damage caused by floods in this region in previous years. The Weather Bureau of the United States Department of Agriculture reports that the record of flood losses in New England is far from complete. In the year 1900 it was estimated that the losses amounted to more than \$1,000,000. In the year 1927 there were various estimates of the losses, ranging from \$45,000,000 to somewhat more than \$50,000,000. These two years are the only ones since 1899 for which estimates may be called fairly complete. From 1927 until the present floods, there have been no floods of consequence, and the damage from the annual spring and fall floods have been estimated as about \$50,000 annually.

In an article in the Monthly Weather Review, December 1914, the writer mentions some of the floods of considerable magnitude in the Connecticut River. Great floods in New England occurred in April 1852, May 1854, April 1862, October 1869, April 1895, and March 1896, besides those of 1900 and 1927.

If during the past number of years a real plan of protection had been embarked upon, all the estimates are that

its cost would never have approached the losses caused by the flood of this past week or of that which occurred in 1927.

The people of New England will rise to this occasion as they have to many other such emergencies. When the waters recede, they will go back to their once lovely homes, their former factories and places of business and rebuild. They will assist one another to repair and rehabilitate. But this is not sufficient. We must build to prevent such damage and destruction in the future.

#### A CONNECTICUT VALLEY AUTHORITY BILL WITH AN APPROPRIATION OF \$50,000,000

More than 1 year ago, on January 29, 1935, I introduced a bill, H. R. 4979, for an appropriation of \$50,000,000 for the development of this river and its tributaries, improvement of navigation, flood control by reforestation and construction of dikes, levees, large dams, and reservoirs which could be used also to generate cheap electricity to share the cost of the undertaking. The bill also granted permission, which is necessary under the Constitution, to the New England States to establish, if they so desire, their own authority and to carry out their own plans and program by making agreements or compacts with each other.

This bill proposed, thorough surveys and studies, the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the whole region, and the immediate initiation and construction of projects, which fitted in and coordinated with a complete scheme of flood control for the whole river and many of its tributaries.

The old method was to build dikes in certain places where it was believed the waters would overflow, but various investigations, studies, and the experiences with the Tennessee, Mississippi, and other rivers proved this was insufficient against extraordinary floods. In addition to large dikes and levees, it is recognized that a series of large reservoirs and high dams are necessary on the tributaries and at the headwaters and other parts of the main stream. When high floods are raging down the river, dikes and levees may not be sufficiently strong to stand the strain, unless in addition the floods are controlled and more evenly regulated by great storage reservoirs and dams. It is also believed that reforestation, especially of the hills, consumes much rainfall and regulates the flow of rivers and streams.

In maintaining a lessened flow during flood seasons by collecting the surplus waters in these great reservoirs floods are regulated, and with a well-planned system of dikes and levees in other places along the river front overflowing of adjoining sections of land is avoided. By maintaining a better regulated flow of water during dry seasons and low-water periods navigation is improved and assistance given to avoidance of pollution. Thus the project has sanitary value, which, of course, is difficult of exact estimation.

It therefore follows that real prevention and control of floods are not to be obtained by the old methods of piecemeal undertakings by a village, town, or city, or even by one State. It is a problem for cooperation of all the States in the whole region, and as the same problem affects the many numerous large rivers of this country, it is a national problem, each region being entitled to assistance and cooperation from the Federal Government.

It is based on the experiences and lessons of many years with the troublesome floods of many of our rivers, and already such coordinated undertakings have been constructed or are planned upon the Mississippi, Colorado, Tennessee, and some other rivers. The War Department engineers have arrived at this conclusion in their plans and proposals for protection along many rivers. The National Resources Board have also arrived at the same conclusion, and in their report of November 1934 they state as follows:

To recommend for any basin an inclusive water plan without an exhaustive study of adequate data bearing on all phases of the many problems involved would be most illogical, would invite and deserve severe criticism, would involve economic waste, and might preclude the formulation of a well-balanced plan later. Unfortunately, fundamental data, the consideration of which is a prerequisite to effective planning of an inclusive character, still are lacking in greater or less degree on both the surface and underground waters of most drainage areas throughout the country.

Representative problems of various basins or groups of basins are noted briefly in the following pages.



## 1. THE NORTH ATLANTIC BASINS

Further utilization of waters in the densely populated North Atlantic seaboard is dependent in large measure on the coordinated development of storage for river regulation. The wide range of administrative and technical problems that are involved in multiple uses of water in this region is illustrated best by the Connecticut and Delaware Basins.

(a) The Connecticut Basin: The lower reaches of the Connecticut River are crowded with manufacturing plants which, together with the accompanying urban areas, have utilized most of the available water power, have made heavy drafts on the stream waters for industrial purposes, and have polluted these waters to such an extent that the river is used for recreation but little and the operation of certain industries is inconvenienced seriously. The congested urban areas are subject to occasional damaging floods. Cooperative efforts to abate objectionable practices in the disposal of obnoxious waste have been initiated recently, but there remains an abundant opportunity to increase the output of prime power, reduce low-water pollution, and minimize or eliminate floods by provisions of additional storage facilities on the tributaries and headwaters. The chief factor standing in the way of this needed development has been the lack of an appropriate agency to make surveys and studies which would recognize all interests, and of an appropriate authority to estimate the costs of feasible works and allocate them among the four States, the scores of municipalities, and the hundreds of business enterprises that would benefit from regulation.

Storms of the intensity of that which caused the great New England flood of 1927, and with an average frequency of about 100 years, are possible throughout almost all of this area. Physiographic conditions are conducive to the development of strong flood flows in most New England and New Jersey drainages, and on the Hudson River above Albany. On the Susquehanna River ice jams have caused very high waters. Damages experienced in the relatively narrow valleys have amounted to as much as \$10,000 per square mile of the drainage area of the river. On some New England streams, such as the Deerfield River, flood flows are absorbed in large measure by storage reservoirs for power or water supply. On other streams, such as the Connecticut River, municipalities have constructed levee systems for local protection. In general, however, flood protection has received little direct attention.

## CRITICISMS—IGNORANT AND SELFISH

Nevertheless, in total disregard of past experiences and lessons, of the opinions of experts and authorities, and of the knowledge of damage caused by yearly floods, a few critics, as are usually found, immediately attacked my proposal. Those who criticize from lack of information can be easily disregarded. But there were another few, representing certain selfish interests, who insidiously attacked my suggestion by dragging across it the red herring of Federal interference. These people shoot their poisonous darts into all such progressive proposals. They raise objections to Federal assistance and are even powerful enough to prevent State cooperation, but the time has arrived when the people of New England will not permit obstruction by certain self-seeking, though powerful interests. Nor will they be fooled by the carping criticisms of these interests, motivated by selfishness and lack of patriotism for New England. The people now recognize these obstructionists who continually attempt to undermine all improvements intended to benefit human beings.

The catastrophe that has occurred within the past few weeks proves the error of these critics. The great damage and loss of life in this region from this month's flood is adequate testimony for the urgency of an immediate program of flood control as I proposed.

## EFFORTS TO OBTAIN PROPER INFORMATION AND REPORTS AS A BASIS FOR CONSIDERING THE CONNECTICUT VALLEY AUTHORITY BILL

Immediately after the introduction of my bill I approached the Flood Committee and also the War Department concerning their studies of the Connecticut River. The following letters I received from them explain their assistance and cooperation in this subject:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1935.

HON. WILLIAM M. CITRON, M. C.,  
The House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CITRON: Reference is made to your desire to obtain a report on the need for flood control on the Connecticut River.

I was very glad to take this matter up with the War Department and in reply received the following statement:

"This Department has completed a field survey of the Connecticut River in the combined interests of navigation, flood control,

irrigation, and the development of hydroelectric power, under the provisions of House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session. The report is now being prepared by the district engineer at Providence, R. I., and is expected in this office in the near future for review by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as required by law prior to its submission to Congress with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

"I have referred your letter to the division engineer, North Atlantic division, for the preparation of a map and a summary of the data on flood control developed in this report which I shall be pleased to forward to you as soon as it is received."

You may be sure it has been a pleasure to have been of some service to you in the matter and I shall keep in close touch with the situation and advise you of any developments.

Yours very truly,

BYRON B. CANN,  
Clerk, Committee on Flood Control.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, March 22, 1935.

HON. RILEY J. WILSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Flood Control,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: In your letter of February 14, 1935, you stated that Hon. WILLIAM M. CITRON, House of Representatives, was interested in obtaining data on the Connecticut River and its tributaries for the purpose of clearly presenting to the Committee on Flood Control the need and merit of such works as is mentioned in the bill, H. R. 4979.

A field survey of the Connecticut River, undertaken under the provisions of House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, has been completed, but the report of the division engineer has not yet been received in this office for review by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors prior to its transmission to Congress, and the conclusions of this Department have therefore not as yet been formulated.

However, I take pleasure in enclosing herewith a résumé of the information contained in this report which I have had prepared by the district engineer at Providence, R. I.

Very truly yours,

G. B. PILLSBURY,  
Brigadier General,  
Acting Chief of Engineers.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, March 25, 1935.

HON. WILLIAM M. CITRON,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CITRON: Complying with your recent verbal request, I take pleasure in enclosing herewith résumé of the report of the district engineer, Providence, R. I., on the survey of the Connecticut River, undertaken under the provisions of House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, in the combined interests of navigation, flood control, and the development of hydroelectric power.

The report of the district engineer is expected in this office shortly for review by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as required by law prior to its transmission to Congress with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. I regret that under a long-established policy of this Department, I am unable to give you a copy of the report of the district engineer until after its transmission to Congress, as such reports are considered confidential until so transmitted.

Very truly yours,

G. B. PILLSBURY,  
Brigadier General,  
Acting Chief of Engineers.

## MILLION DOLLAR AMENDMENT TO FLOOD-CONTROL BILL FOR CONNECTICUT RIVER IS INADEQUATE

Pending this flood-control and the water-power report to Congress by the Chief Engineer, which was based on studies and surveys made by the district engineer, the House passed a flood-control bill which is now pending in the Senate. To that bill I proposed the following amendment on August 22, 1935, which was adopted:

Amendment offered by Mr. CITRON: Page 53, after line 16, add the following paragraph:

"Connecticut River Basin flood control and protection on the Connecticut River by means of bank-protection works, channel enlargement, flood walls and dikes; survey and data in the office of the Chief of Engineers; cost, \$1,000,000."

This sum is insufficient for real protection when we realize that every town along the Connecticut River suffered during the present flood; but it is interesting to note that there were many skeptics when this amendment was passed. These skeptics questioned the need of any money for flood control upon the Connecticut River.

## HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 377—FOR STATE COMPACTS

On August 13, 1935, I introduced this resolution granting permission to the States to enter into compacts for planning



and undertaking flood control. Some of the States have State planning commissions, and with some interest being shown at the time in State compacts, I introduced this bill to facilitate action by the States and to focus further attention upon flood prevention.

#### INTERSTATE ASSISTANCE WITH FEDERAL COOPERATION IS NECESSARY

All States involved must cooperate and assist in carrying out any formulated plan. Thorough remedial measures cannot be carried out by one State alone.

The Connecticut River is a navigable stream and the Constitution gives the Federal Government jurisdiction over it. When the State of Massachusetts several years ago threatened to divert waters from this river, Connecticut sought the assistance of the Federal Government and courts to prevent any menace to its navigability. This whole subject interests the Federal Government because any measures undertaken vitally affect navigation. Congress can grant the States permission to do certain things, but it cannot grant away the powers conferred upon it under the Constitution. Therefore whatever is done must have the permission of the Federal Government, who must reserve to itself its constitutional powers and certain control.

#### WAR DEPARTMENT PLANS

The States have the assistance of the Federal Government, which through the War Department engineers, has made intensive studies and surveys, formulated a partial plan, and can do a great deal of the construction work, when authorized by Congress. The engineers have already formulated a general plan for flood control and power development. Should the States undertake it alone or avail themselves of the assistance of the Federal Government? Whatever they plan and do must be authorized by the Federal Government. If it is their desire to share in the undertaking, they should not refuse material and financial assistance from the Federal Government. This general plan is based on surveys and studies authorized by congressional act in 1927. The War Department engineers do not favor proceeding with the general plan now, but favor immediate undertaking of a part, which they call the "initial program", and then only if local authorities for the States share the expense. Their main argument is that the benefits to navigation for which they are responsible is not represented in the total outlay and that there is no immediate market for power. This reasoning is not very cogent and is not based on fact.

I favor the undertaking of the complete plan, the Federal Government to take care of most of the cost. I recognize the necessity of the interested States collaborating immediately so as to decide which part of the program they will participate in. In the knowledge and experience gained from the present flood it may be necessary for the War Department

Engineers to make some alteration in their plans and conclusions and this is another reason for the need of immediate cooperation by the States.

If Congress decides at the present time to incorporate only the so-called "initial plan", I believe the million dollars already in the bill should remain to pay for the cost of levees and dikes in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and that the whole cost should be paid by the Federal Government. The "initial plan" will hardly assist the lower parts of the valley; it is a practical guaranty and assurance against floods to Vermont and to that region.

Ever since my coming to Congress I have continuously addressed myself to and corresponded with various Government officials and with public-spirited nongovernmental organizations urging this undertaking. I believe the people of New England, in and out of this valley, want immediate consideration by both the State and Federal authorities for this river and some of the other New England rivers.

I have taken the following from the United States Army Engineers' report, known as House Document 412, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session:

5. Power development: The Connecticut Basin has extensive water-power resources of which the most economical and easily developed have been improved. New or redeveloped projects must depend in general upon additional storage for their justification. A comprehensive plan for the ultimate development of power in the basin is presented. This plan includes 19 storage reservoirs with effective storage capacity of 770,300 acre-feet, constructed for the benefit of downstream power plants; and 22 power developments with a proposed installed capacity of 373,600 kilowatts, having an estimated average annual output of 1,276,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The district engineer states that the comprehensive plan as presented indicates the future hydroelectric potentialities of the Connecticut Basin, but that further developments must be on a step-by-step basis as additional power is required.

6. Flood control: Floods are comparatively frequent in the Connecticut Basin and cause serious damages, particularly the great but less-frequent fall floods that have their source on the upper and western tributaries. The most serious flood for which comprehensive data are available occurred in November 1927. This flood caused damages estimated at \$15,500,000, the greater part being to railroad and highway facilities. No general flood-control measures have been taken, the only existing works consisting of dikes and bank protection on the lower main river. A fair degree of protection is afforded on certain tributaries by power and water supply storage reservoirs.

7. The only practicable method of obtaining flood protection is found to be by storage reservoirs, although along the lower river additional dikes and bank revetments may be desirable. A comprehensive plan includes 33 reservoirs with a total effective storage capacity of 931,000 acre-feet and estimated to cost \$41,082,000 with annual charges at \$2,875,000, operated in the combined interest of flood control and power development. The district engineer estimates that flood damages would be reduced on an average of \$294,000 annually and that the storage would have an economic value to existing and potential power developments of \$2,320,000. He finds that no present or prospective market exists for the large increase in power. An initial flood-control project is presented by the district engineer to provide 10 reservoirs as follows:

Tributary basin	Reservoir	Dam			Drainage area controlled (square miles)	Gross capacity (acre-feet) †	Estimated first cost (not including land and damages)	Estimated cost of land and damages
		Type	Maximum height	Length (feet)				
Passumpsic	Lyndonville	Earth	90	984	70	10,800	\$1,066,000	\$151,000
Do.	Lyndon Center	do.	80	1,570	54	31,700	1,305,000	217,000
Do.	Victory	do.	56	560	66	61,000	314,000	207,000
Ammonoosuc	Bethlehem Junction	do.	150	1,112	90	24,200	1,538,000	450,000
Do.	Gale River	Concrete and earth	86	488	86	10,400	351,000	147,000
Ompompanoosuc	Union Village	Concrete	120	850	126	22,000	851,000	133,000
White	Gayville	do.	175	550	226	95,300	1,672,000	1,088,000
Do.	Ayers Brook	Earth	80	2,530	30	23,400	745,000	228,000
Do.	South Tun bridge	do.	85	820	102	25,700	521,000	445,000
Ottawaquechee	Bridgewater Corners	do.	125	1,210	101	48,000	1,459,000	455,000
Total					951	352,500	9,852,000	3,521,000
Total estimated first cost (not including land and damages)								9,852,000
Total								13,373,000

†Includes 268,300 acre-feet below spillway crest for power, and 84,200 acre-feet surcharge storage for flood control only.

The estimated annual charges are \$670,000 if financed at low-interest rates. The district engineer estimates that the plan would reduce average annual flood damages by \$174,500, and that the value to existing power plants would be approximately \$335,000 annually; that the plan, by increasing stream flow, would improve sanitary conditions, and that it would reduce the annual charges for local flood-protection works in Massachusetts, \$35,000. He considers the initial plan to be economically justified if

financed at existing low-interest rates, and the creation of an interstate agency for its execution to be desirable.

8. The division engineer concurs in the views and recommendations of the district engineer as to the navigation improvements. He considers that the plans presented for flood control and power development afford an ultimate rational development; that the first cost and annual charges of the initial flood-control plan proposed by the district engineer apparently prevent its



justification unless and until power developments can be combined with flood control, with power carrying about half the cost of the plan; and that under existing conditions realization of the initial flood-control plan will probably be delayed pending development of a demand for the added power made possible by the plan. He considers that joint action by the several States to create an agency with authority to adopt, finance, and execute a project for effective flood protection appears to be logical and desirable. He is of the opinion that there is insufficient Federal interest in such a project to justify participation therein by the United States.

9. The reports have been referred as required by law to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and attention is invited to its report herewith. The Board finds that the project now authorized by Congress for improvement of the river below Hartford will adequately meet the present needs of navigation in that section of the river. It states that modification of the existing project for navigation between Hartford and Holyoke to provide for the construction of the dam and lock at Enfield Rapids by the United States instead of by local interests does not appear warranted at present, and that in its opinion no change should be made in the project as now authorized. It finds no justification for the extension of navigation above Holyoke.

10. The Board has carefully analyzed the plans proposed for the initial construction of 10 reservoirs on selected tributaries for the control of the sources of summer and fall floods. It finds that these reservoirs may be operated to reconcile the interests of flood control and power, with no material sacrifice of effectiveness, reserving sufficient storage so that the peak of a great fall flood would be so reduced as to be no longer destructive. The annual average benefits in reducing flood losses are estimated at \$180,000, the value of water at existing power plants would probably not exceed \$300,000, and the prospective value of the increased flow at four potential new power sites on the main stem of the river is estimated at \$158,000, a total of \$638,000. The estimated annual cost of the improvement, with interest at 4 percent, and amortization in 50 years, is estimated at \$697,000. The Board points out that the economic justification of the project is not established by these figures. The project has, however, intangible indirect values in improving sanitary conditions, in reducing delays and inconvenience to navigation, and in generally increasing public convenience by the reduction in flood heights and increasing low-water flow, all of which render the project worthy of favorable consideration. The Board is of the opinion that the general benefits warrant a Federal expenditure of 50 percent of the first cost of the structures in this initial flood-control plan. It is of the opinion, however, that the creation of an interstate authority to construct the works and assess the benefits does not appear likely of realization, but that the formation within the States of conservancy districts with power to negotiate agreements for payment of stored water, and to raise funds by assessment of local benefits, would be much more readily accomplished.

It points out that the construction of the proposed reservoirs could be effected by the creation of two such districts in the State of Vermont, one embracing the White and adjacent basins, the other the Passumpsic Basin; and one district in New Hampshire embracing the Ammonoosuc Basin; or by a wider bi-State authority embracing the entire watershed within the States of Vermont and New Hampshire. The Board does not find that contracts with existing power interests for the use of stored water and for increasing low-water flow can be expected to meet a large part of the cost of the lands and structures under present conditions, but that a considerable expenditure by the districts would be required even with the Federal contribution outlined. If local interests are prepared to incur these expenditures, the Board considers that the Federal expenditure is warranted. It recommends a Federal project for the construction of storage reservoirs in the tributaries of the Connecticut River substantially in accordance with the initial flood-control plan presented by the district engineer, provided that local interests, through organized conservancy districts, agree to provide all rights-of-way, assume all damages, pay one-half the cost of construction, and agree to take over and operate the works after their completion, in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of War.

11. After due consideration of these reports, I concur in the views of the Board. The improvement authorized by Congress for the Connecticut River below Hartford will provide adequately for present needs of navigation. The approved project above Hartford is contingent upon the construction by local interests of a dam at Enfield Rapids. No justification is seen for modification of the project to provide for construction of this lock and dam by the United States. Floods in the Connecticut Basin do much damage. An initial flood-control plan to provide 10 reservoirs on selected tributaries would afford effective relief from the disastrous summer and fall floods. The direct benefits of the plan in reducing flood heights, together with the intangible indirect benefits to sanitation and in reducing delays and inconveniences to navigation warrant, in my opinion, the execution of the project by the Federal Government provided that local interests, through organized conservancy districts meet the conditions of local cooperation proposed by the Board.

I therefore report that a Federal project for the construction of storage reservoirs on headwater tributaries of the Connecticut River, substantially in accordance with the initial flood-control plan presented by the district engineer, is advisable in the interest of flood control, power development, and navigation, at a total estimated cost of \$13,373,000, provided that local interests, through organized conservancy districts with adequate powers and re-

sources, agree to provide all rights-of-way without cost to the United States, assume all damages, pay one-half the cost of construction, and take over and operate the works after completion in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of War. Since any reservoir or group of reservoirs included in the complete plan will afford generally proportionate benefits, the construction of any one of these reservoirs or group of reservoirs shall be undertaken when the conditions of local cooperation have been fulfilled with respect to such reservoir or group of reservoirs. The total estimated Federal expenditure required under the complete plan of improvement is \$4,926,000.

E. M. MARKHAM,  
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

#### WORLD WAR DEBTS

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, for those of us who have carried on the fight for a reasonable and sensible solution of the World War debts, two events have occurred this week that are deeply significant and should not be passed by without notice in this body.

A Paris dispatch stated that former Premier Edouard Herriot was basing his campaign on the necessity of paying the World War debts, while across the water 2 days later a London dispatch asserted that David Lloyd George, wartime Prime Minister, was charging in characteristic fashion that the failure to pay the war debts to the United States was just as heinous as the remilitarization of the Rhineland.

I am certainly glad to see this revival of interest in our sister Republic, France, the more so since that distinguished Government was most emphatic in its insistence that the money advanced to it during the World War was a loan and not a gift. As a matter of fact, our war ambassador had a conference with the French Premier in those war days and wired the Secretary of State on April 11, 1917, the following:

The Premier personally expressed the hope to me that no resolution would be introduced or debated in Congress tending to make a gift to the Government of France from the United States however much the sentiment of good will prompting it might be appreciated by the French people. In view of France's action in the Franklin agreements in the years 1782 and 1783 in the time of our own distress, I hope I may be permitted to suggest that it would appear to be a generous and gracious thing should such an arrangement prove feasible in making the French loan at this time to stipulate that no interest shall be charged or be payable on such a loan during the war and thereafter for a limited number of years.

An article in the *Le Matin* of June 28, 1926, has copies of cables between Ambassador Jusserand and the French Premier in the following translations:

APRIL 12, 1917.

#### DIPLOMATIE PARIS:

I have just had an interview with the Secretary of the Treasury regarding our financial needs. The amount of \$133,000,000 a month drew no observation from him; the amount of \$218,000,000, which would be reached by adding our expenses outside the United States, appeared high to him, but it is not impossible that we shall get it.

As one of our Allies has made some remarks on the necessity of equal treatment for all, under the pretext that the contrary would be humiliating, special favors for France are no longer spoken of, although it is possible that more will be heard of this later.

The rate of interest will be the same that the Government of the United States will be able to obtain, probably 3½ percent, with a guaranty that if subsequent loans are made at a higher rate the same interest will be paid to the holders of the first loan.

This interest, by the terms of the law, shall be paid by all the Allied countries concerned. As to the term for repayment, I mentioned (supposing this to be desirable) that of 15 years. Mr. McAnoo said that he had no objection to that.

JUSSERAND.

APRIL 17, 1917.

I shall do my best in the matter of repayment in 25 years, but I cannot refrain from pointing out how much easier things would have been made for me if, instead of speaking, as was done, in the imprecise terms, in your telegram no. 536, of a term "as long as possible", the department had told me 25 years, since it had a settled idea on this subject.

I believed that I had good reason to suppose that 15 years would be considered satisfactory.

I cannot too urgently recommend the utmost possible precision in all these practical and urgent affairs with which I am now occupied.

(Signed) JUSSERAND.



The World War Debt Commission, which was created by the act of February 9, 1922, "to review and convert obligations held by United States of America, and for other purposes", took as its fundamental premise "the capacity of the debtor nations to pay." It considered that each nation under obligation to us should be considered by itself and it, as a commission, should take into consideration three fundamental studies—foreign trade, the total wealth, and the total income. Those three principal factors should be indicative of the capacities to pay all the instrumentalities of each government; the total foreign trade which has a bearing on the capacity to effect payments abroad, the total wealth speaking for itself, and the total national income for the ultimate source of a country's capacity to pay. It was obviously interested in the stabilization of currency and any method that would tend to aid the respective ships of state to keep an even keel. It was, of course, anxious to have a prosperous Europe as a prosperous customer, and if it erred at all it erred on the side of charity. Systematic studies were made of various countries and their capacities to pay. If it made any further mistakes these were the failures to more thoroughly scrutinize the efforts of the great banking houses in this country in their paralleled attempts to float private loans. That Commission justified a settlement on the basis of 26 percent with Italy as against a 50-percent settlement with France and 84 percent with England.

The differences in settlement are understandable when one reviews the hearings and understands the psychology of the American Debt Commission. It honestly believed that these percentages would be most helpful not only in assisting the United States in securing a real share of the war debts but would be most helpful in the rehabilitation of the countries themselves.

It is significant also that the charges of Lloyd George bear out our previous contentions about the solemnity and sanctity of these debt agreements as treaty obligations and that if the compacts of nations are to be worth anything in the future there must be an understandable agreement that it is an essential purpose of the debtor nations that no nation can liberate itself from engagements of a treaty except with the other contracting parties' consent.

The statements of the wartime premier is a direct attack on the age-old doctrine of *rebus sic stantibus*. Under the guise of that vicious principle, there has been throughout the ages an implied and understood condition of all treaties that when material circumstances on which treaties have rested have altered so as to render performance impracticable and unduly onerous the party thus disadvantaged may repudiate the treaty. The capricious irresponsibility of this doctrine is seen in the admission that every sovereign state has the exclusive right to determine for itself when the stipulation of a treaty becomes impracticable of performance; thus each nation has a privilege of unlimited discretion in this respect; and when a nation, therefore, determines that it is to its advantage to shelve a treaty, there can be no appeal except to the arbitrament of war. This doctrine *conventio omnis intelligentur rebus sic stantibus*, as it is known in the Latin phrase, is an invitation not only to wanton, flagrant disregard of the sanctities of international covenants but it points out also to all nations the necessity for ample unnecessary military power and armaments to withstand or overawe objections in the case of repudiations. It fosters war.

The history of nations in the exploitation of this doctrine is not confined to continental powers but has been unfortunately used by this country. As a matter of fact many treaties of the United States have not only been violated by this method but by congressional action, for it is now settled constitutional doctrine that a prior treaty may be repealed by a later statute, and we have a number of instances in our own history which reflect no credit on our own attitude in this respect.

Lloyd George recognized the abuse of the doctrine and criticized the British House of Commons on its implied use of this theory in shelving the debts. The press dispatches also pointed out that the brilliant Welchman made a dra-

matic gesture in pointing directly at Prime Minister Baldwin, who had been instrumental in obtaining the British debt settlement in America. It is significant also that a spirited rejoinder to the attack came from Austin Chamberlain, former foreign secretary, whose remarks were greeted with pro-cabinet cheers and opposition jeers when he said:

His Majesty's Government never repudiated its obligations to the United States. No country, no person can be bound to fulfill the impossible.

Germany was not physically strong enough to maintain the demilitarization of the Rhineland zone, as we were physically unable to make payment to America.

Thus it is seen that the ever-present debt discussions are again the cause of parliamentary campaign tactics, but the excuse this time for repudiation is another vicious abuse of treaty obligations.

Once again we repeat the very charitable and understanding remarks of the President of the United States in his speech of June 1, 1934, on the World War debt, wherein he said—

these debts are actual loans made under distinct understanding and with the intention that they would be repaid. Debt settlements made in each case take into consideration the capacity to pay of the individual debtor nations. The money loaned by the United States Government was in turn borrowed by the United States Government from the people of the United States, and our Government, in the absence of payment from foreign governments, is compelled to raise the shortage by general taxation of its own people in order to pay off the original Liberty bonds and the later refunding bonds. It is for these reasons that the American people have felt that their debtors were called upon to make a determined effort to discharge these obligations. The American people would not be disposed to place an impossible burden upon their debtors, but are nevertheless in a just position to ask that substantial sacrifices be made to meet these debts. We shall continue to expect the debtors on their part to show full understanding of the American attitude on this debt question.

The people of the debtor nations will also bear in mind the fact that the American people are certain to be swayed by the use which debtor countries make of their available resources, whether such resources would be applied for the purposes of recovery as well as for reasonable payment on the debt owed to the citizens of the United States or for purposes of unproductive nationalistic expenditure or like purposes. I can only repeat that I have made it clear to the debtor nations again and again that "the indebtedness to our Government has no relation whatsoever to reparations payments made or owed to them, and that each individual nation has full and free opportunity individually to discuss its problems with the United States. We are using every means to persuade each debtor nation as to the sacredness of the obligation and also to assure them of our willingness, if they should so request, to discuss frankly and fully the special circumstances relating to means and method of payment. Recognizing that the final power lies with the Congress, I shall keep the Congress informed from time to time and make such new recommendations as may later seem advisable."

The President has been most fair in his treatment, and it is to be hoped that the prodding of foreign nations by men whose efforts in the past have been so far fruitless will be the cause of a sensible and reasonable debt clearance.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DRISCOLL, for Monday and Tuesday next, on account of important and urgent business.

To Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, for 1 week, on account of important official business.

To Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana, for 2 weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. Sisson (at the request of Mr. O'CONNOR), for several days, on account of illness.

To Mr. ZIMMERMAN, for 1 week, on account of important business.

#### CANCELATION OF MAIL CONTRACTS

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution having been refused, is the resolution now referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries?

The SPEAKER. It is within the discretion of the Chair to refer it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I believe I asked is it now referred?

The SPEAKER. No; it has not been referred.



## JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 543. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1936 for emergency relief of residents of the District of Columbia.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Monday, March 30, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

739. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the admission of certain documents in evidence in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

740. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill to allow credit for all outstanding disallowances and suspensions in the accounts of disbursing officers or agents of the Government for payments made for adjustments and increases in compensation of Government officers and employees pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order No. 6746 of June 21, 1934, and Executive orders which that order superseded; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 234. Joint resolution authorizing the Senate Special Committee on Investigation of Lobbying Activities to employ counsel, in connection with certain legal proceedings, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2288. An act to provide for the measurement of vessels using the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2524. An act amending section 112 of the United States Code, annotated (title 28; subtitle "Civil Suits; where to be brought"); with amendment (Rept. No. 2257). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CORNING: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10631. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2258). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETTENGILL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11685. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River at or near Merom, Sullivan County, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2259). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 3450. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the erection of a memorial to the officers and men of the United States Navy who lost their lives as the result of a boiler explosion that totally destroyed the U. S. S. *Tulip* near St. Inigoes Bay, Md., on November 11, 1864, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 8998. A bill to authorize the erection of a monument in memory of

Capt. Moses Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 9040. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial in the national cemetery of Philadelphia, Pa., in honor of the 40 unknown soldiers of America's wars who lie buried there; with amendment (Rept. No. 2262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 10716. A bill securing memorial for John Jay, first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 467. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to the late Haym Salomon; without amendment (Rept. No. 2264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 470. Joint resolution to authorize the selection of a site and the erection thereon of a suitable monument as a memorial to Betsy Ross; without amendment (Rept. No. 2265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 481. Joint resolution to make available to Congress the services and data of the Interstate Reference Bureau; without amendment (Rept. No. 2266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. Senate Joint Resolution 151. Joint resolution making provision for a national celebration of the bicentenary of the birth of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, wealthiest signer of the Declaration of Independence; with amendment (Rept. No. 2267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 9484. A bill to amend section 36 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 526. Joint resolution to authorize the Librarian of Congress to accept the property devised and bequeathed to the United States of America by the last will and testament of Joseph Pennell, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 2269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 11849. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925; without amendment (Rept. No. 2270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 11617. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of the Coosa River, Ga., and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 11793. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of various creeks in the State of California with a view to the control of their floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 11806. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of Passaic River, N. J., with a view to the control of its floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 12037. A bill relating to compacts and agreements among States in which tobacco is produced providing for the control of



production of, or commerce in, tobacco in such States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 11968. A bill relating to the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make rehabilitation loans for the repair of damages caused by floods or other catastrophes, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 12014. A bill relating to the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make rehabilitation loans for the repair of damages caused by floods or other catastrophes, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 12054) relating to the authority of existing Federal agencies to establish a Flood Rehabilitation Administration for the repair of damages caused by floods or other catastrophes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 12055) to terminate certain taxes on palm-kernel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 12056) authorizing the State of Iowa, acting through its State highway commission, and the State of Nebraska, acting through its department of roads and irrigation, to construct, maintain, and operate a free or toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Dodge Street in the city of Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELCHER: A bill (H. R. 12057) for the restriction of immigration; to prevent the purchase and possession of firearms by aliens; and to provide for the deportation of criminal and certain other aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 12058) to provide for an examination and survey to determine the best utilization of the surplus waters of the San Juan River and to determine the feasibility and cost of storing such waters and of diverting them to the Rio Chama; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 12059) to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHANDLER: A bill (H. R. 12060) to amend section 80 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 12061) to authorize the President to designate an acting High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GREENWAY: A bill (H. R. 12062) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept unsurveyed lands in numbered school sections in the State of Arizona in exchange for certain other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12063) to amend section 28 of the Enabling Act for the State of Arizona, approved June 20, 1910; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 12064) to amend the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, to prevent loss of assets and excessive charges in connection with certain reorganizations, compositions, and extensions, and to aid the district courts in the administration thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIES: Resolution (H. Res. 468) providing for the appointment of a special committee to make a study of all existing statutes, Executive orders, rules, and regulations which relate to immigration, deportation, naturalization, and expatriation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLAND: Resolution (H. Res. 469) for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 238; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONAGHAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 549) to make JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY honorary poet laureate of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GASQUE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 550) to refund taxes collected under the Bankhead Act and Kerr-Smith Act, and to redeem certain exemption certificates issued thereunder; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL: A bill (H. R. 12065) for the relief of the Lake Chelan reclamation district; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12066) to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation against Eugenio Pupo and to declare lawful his admission to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 12067) for the relief of Clifford Y. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 12068) for the relief of Miriam Grant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINZER: A bill (H. R. 12069) granting an increase of pension to Hettie A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12070) for the relief of Charles Dancause and Virginia P. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOM: A bill (H. R. 12071) for the relief of Paul Custer Wiand; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 12072) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10610. By Mr. BIERMANN: Memorial of the Townsend Club, No. 1, of Cresco, Iowa, favoring House bill 7154; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10611. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition filed by George Mesingham containing signatures of 400 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of House bill 8540, the national lottery bill introduced by Mr. KENNEY, of New Jersey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10612. By Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, requiring that preference in employment on relief projects be given to citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10613. By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Resolution of the Huron Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the passage of Senate bills 3958 and 3959; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

10614. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the county of Los Angeles, State of California, relative to Federal relief funds for the State of California, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10615. Also, resolution of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Lieutenant Kenneth Bell Post, No. 1053, relative to the passage of House bill 11171, providing for an additional 200 beds at the San Fernando Veterans' Hospital, etc.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

10616. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Mrs. B. F. Baughman, president, and Mrs. Karl R. Ausenheimer, secretary, Hesperian Club, Columbus, Ohio, urging hearings on the



motion-picture bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10617. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition signed by residents in Westchester County, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 10189; to the Committee on Education.

10618. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions passed by the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to requiring that preference be given to citizens of the United States in employment on unemployment relief projects financed by Federal funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 30, 1936

(Legislative day of Monday, Feb. 24, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 27, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11663) to require reports of receipts and disbursements of certain contributions, to require the registration of persons engaged in attempting to influence legislation, to prescribe punishments for violation of this act, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	La Follette	Reynolds
Ashurst	Copeland	Lewis	Robinson
Austin	Couzens	Logan	Russell
Bachman	Davis	Loneragan	Schwollenbach
Barkley	Donahay	Long	Sheppard
Bilbo	Duffy	McGill	Shipstead
Black	Fletcher	McKellar	Smith
Bone	Frazier	McNary	Stelwer
Borah	George	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gibson	Metcalf	Townsend
Bulkeley	Glass	Minton	Truman
Bulow	Guffey	Moore	Tydings
Burke	Hale	Murphy	Vandenberg
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Walsh
Capper	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Caraway	Holt	Overton	White
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	
Chavez	Keyes	Pope	
Clark	King	Radcliffe	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO] are absent because of illness; and I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. COOLIDGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BENSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is necessarily absent from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### UNNECESSARY RENEWALS OF OATHS BY CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORT ON THE TENNESSEE RIVER SYSTEM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, submitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Unified Development of the Tennessee River System, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### PRICE BASES INQUIRY—RANGE-BOILER INDUSTRY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Price Bases Inquiry—the Zone-Price Formula in the Range-Boiler Industry", being the second of the Commission's reports of an inquiry into the general subject of price bases, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

### ANNUAL REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chief scout executive of the Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 26th annual report of the Boy Scouts of America, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Alabama, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Senate concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to establish a national park on the site of Coosa, that ancient Indian city visited by De Soto's army in the year 1540, commemorating the oldest historical site in America

Whereas it is fully authenticated that De Soto's army, consisting of 600 soldiers and 2,000 burden bearers, encamped and was entertained at Coosa for 2 months in the year 1540—a longer stop, by far, than any other on his march of over 4,000 miles in continental America; and

Whereas the stock of food in that Indian city was sufficient, not only for sustenance of 2,600 visitors for 2 months, but to provide burdens for 500 additional bearers (2,500 in all) upon their departure—proof that the city was of great size, as compared with other known Indian settlements of any period; and

Whereas the archives in the national library at Seville in Spain contain numerous confirmatory documents, including letters written by De Soto's officers while encamped at Coosa, identifying beyond any doubt the historical accuracy of his reported visit; and

Whereas the site on east bank of Coosa River, between Tallaseehatchee Creek and Talladega Creek, in Talladega County, Ala., is clearly identified as the location of Coosa, in the opinion of practically all accepted authorities on aboriginal history; and

Whereas the relative antiquity of De Soto's visit to Coosa, in comparison with other proven occurrences or incidents in American history, is emphasized by the fact that the Spanish army encamped in that great city at a time antedating the founding of St. Augustine by 25 years; the settlement of Jamestown by 70 years, and the landing of the Pilgrims by 80 years, and the further amazing fact that we have yet three-quarters of a century to go before reaching a period as far on this side of the Revolutionary War as De Soto's visit to Coosa stands on the other side of it. Furthermore, its great size suggests that Coosa was an old city even at that remote date—possibly contemporaneous with the Mayan cities. Certainly the earliest placed, and extending furthest into the mists of antiquity, Coosa is, at once, the genesis and the ultima Thule of American history; and

Whereas there is an established American custom of commemorating events of national historical interest, by recognition in the form of parks on the site, of such magnitude as the historical or scenic value may justify; and

Whereas the site of Coosa is bounded on three sides by a magnificent river and two large creeks, fringed with virgin growth of timber, yet undisturbed, and encompassed at distances of 10 and 30 miles, respectively, with mountain ranges of such height as gives inspiring setting for the proposed park; and

Whereas the site is adjacent to two railroads and a trunk highway, and conveniently accessible for visitors from all parts of our country by rail or automobile: Now, therefore, be it